

One associate pastor at the Baptist Church had several talks with Sirhan and he reported that Sirhan appeared to be a very intense atheist. Sirhan could see no logical reason to believe in God. The pastor felt that Sirhan's beliefs were being reinforced by a junior high school teacher who gave him literature to read. A family associate at the Baptist Church recalled that Sirhan was extremely bitter and unhappy and that he complained about the laws of the United States.

In the early part of 1968, Sirhan began taking Bible studies from a member of the Seventh Day Adventist Church. They met in Sirhan's home on Tuesday evening but Sirhan did not seem to accept the teachings. Sirhan discontinued the meetings in late March.

#### Sirhan's Involvement With Cults and Mysticism

In 1966 Sirhan applied for membership in the Rosicrucian Order. He was a correspondence member of the San Jose, California Order and was known to have attended only one meeting of the Order, that occurred on May 28, 1968, in Pasadena. Sirhan signed the roster but witnesses reported that his appearance at the meeting was unremarkable. He had been dropped as a member in April 1967, when his dues were not paid; however, on February 5, 1968 and March 26, 1968, money orders from Sirhan were received by the Order, paying his dues in advance.

After Sirhan's confinement in the Los Angeles County Jail on June 5, 1968, he requested two books which had to do with a world religious cult called the Theosophical Society. Friends

of Sirhan's attested to his interest in theosophy; a book store employee in Pasadena reported that Sirhan was in his book store on five or six occasions and that he invariably looked at books on religion and mysticism.

A great deal of attention was given the report of Sirhan's interest in theosophy. Conflicting evaluations as to the type of influence that the cult may have had upon Sirhan were made by various persons. It was contended by one author that theosophy was a "killer cult" while another source found that the teachings taught the brotherhood of man and not violence. The significance of Sirhan's involvement with mysticism could not be fully ascertained without verification from Sirhan himself.

#### Political Background

Sirhan was not a known member of any political party nor could he vote due to his alien status. Though he expressed highly vocal political views at times his political preference was not known.

Sirhan was known to have been concerned about United States foreign policy regarding the Middle-East and one witness described him as "frustrated" in his political feelings. A mailman reported that he delivered pro-Nasser, anti-American hate literature to Sirhan. This assertion was never proven during the investigation and evidence indicated that the assertion was not true.

Two former students recalled that Sirhan participated in group discussions with fellow Arab students attending Pasadena City College.

During one discussion Sirhan expressed the feeling that the United States Congressional Committee system was unfair and undemocratic. This was especially true, he said, when the wrong people controlled the committees.

## INVESTIGATIONS OF POSSIBLE CONSPIRACIES

This investigation uncovered a great number of allegations implicating Sirhan and other individuals or groups in conspiracies to kill Robert Kennedy. Several of these allegations were based on the statements of witnesses who believed they overheard or observed Sirhan under suspicious circumstances prior to the assassination. Other investigations were based upon Sirhan's alleged association with political or social groups or specific persons who may have assisted him or influenced his thinking.

The notoriety which accompanied the assassination, and the mystery surrounding Sirhan's character and background, made the subject of conspiracy fertile ground for evoking unusual responses from the general public. Opportunists, political adventurers and publicity seekers came forward to volunteer that they had seen or spoken to Sirhan or that they had information which was valuable to the investigation. Investigations were made into each allegation with generally negative results. The majority of the persons making the allegations were found to be lying for one reason or another. Many were found to be either using the assassination to further their own private cause or to enhance their position among their associates.

Several allegations, however, were valid in one way or another, and after investigation were found to be either insignificant or relevant and applicable to the case. Nevertheless, these few cases represented a very small number and were generally not important to the overall investigation. As might be expected, due to the reluctance of witnesses or insufficiency

of information, a few of the allegations remain partially unresolved; to some extent, resolution of these cases cannot be made because the witnesses have refused to cooperate with the Department.

#### EVENTS AT THE HOTEL AND CAMPAIGN HEADQUARTERS

##### The Polka Dot Dress Investigation

The most publicized of the conspiracy allegations involving Sirhan was that of Miss Sandra Serrano who stated that she observed a girl in a black and white polka dot dress running from the scene of the shooting. The girl yelled at Serrano as she and a male passed her, "We shot him; we shot him." When Serrano asked her who she shot, the woman responded, "We just shot Senator Kennedy."

Serrano's account of this occurrence was broadcast as a description of possible additional suspects after she was interviewed by NBC News about what she observed. Serrano stated to investigators that she was seated on an outside stairway of the hotel prior to the shooting. One woman and two men passed her; and approximately twenty minutes later after hearing gunshots, the woman and one of the men ran by her yelling the remarks. Serrano subsequently identified Sirhan as the male who did not return to the stairs with the woman.

Serrano's account was substantiated somewhat by the account of Vincent Di Pierro who was in the kitchen at the time of the shooting. He reported observing Sirhan talking with a woman in a polka dot dress just prior to the shooting.

Investigators questioned the truth of Serrano's allegation after parts of her story conflicted and physical evidence tended to show that she could not have heard the gunshots nor have been where she said she was at the time of the shooting. She was given a polygraph examination, and the results revealed that she was lying completely about the occurrence. Vincent Di Pierro also lied during the polygraph examination given to him. Both subsequently admitted that they had been untruthful and that they had discussed the description of the dress between one another prior to being interviewed by police.

As a result of the Serrano allegation, six persons were investigated as possible suspects. Each was cleared of complicity in the shooting prior to the refutation of the allegation. A "Kennedy Girl," who was in the kitchen at the time of the shooting, was wearing a green dress with gold polka dots. It was speculated that Di Pierro may have become confused about this girl during the chaos following the shooting and later when he spoke to Serrano. The girl did not speak to Sirhan nor was she near enough to be seen with him.

#### Khaibar Kahn Investigation

Khaibar Khan, an Iranian national in the United States, was the subject of an investigation by this Department because of his Mid-Eastern appearance and peculiar behavior. He had acted as a volunteer worker at the Kennedy Campaign Headquarters from June 1 to June 4, 1968. Khan was responsible for submitting the names of twenty-four other volunteer workers, all of whom were of Mid-Eastern extraction.

It was alleged that Khan was seen speaking to Sirhan at the headquarters, and Sirhan was alleged to have been wearing a gun at the time. During the investigation, statements by Khan indicated that he felt that he may have seen Sirhan at the headquarters on June 4, 1968.

Khan was described by fellow volunteer workers as being well-mannered, somewhat overdressed, insincere, and that he appeared to be a "phony." Two volunteer workers reported seeing Khan talking to Sirhan on separate occasions, June 2 and June 4, both at the headquarters.

One of the witnesses retracted the allegation after being shown several mugs of Sirhan. The statements of the other witnesses were refuted by other volunteer workers at the headquarters and evidence that Sirhan was at another location at the alleged time.

Several interviews with Khan revealed that he was a very unusual individual whose behavior was secretive and enigmatic. Khan described himself as an exile from Iran who was in the United States attempting to elicit support for his anti-Iranian government movement. Khan himself denied any association with Sirhan and all evidence tended to support this.

Khan was unsure that he had observed Sirhan, but he refused to take a polygraph examination or to attend a lineup. Khan expressed the opinion that he did not want to become involved in an affair involving the Arabian countries and the Jewish State.

The allegations of witnesses were discounted by statements and evidence from other sources; and Khan, upon further reflection, was unable to state that he had seen Sirhan at the headquarters. The investigation concluded that Sirhan was probably not in the Kennedy Headquarters prior to the assassination.

#### John Antoine Khoury Investigation

On June 6, 1968, Mr. Fred Droz, a businessman with offices at the Ambassador Hotel, reported that he had seen John Khoury near a fountain just before midnight on June 4. Droz was contacted by an ex-professor of his on June 5, who asked him if he had seen Khoury at the hotel. Mr. Joel Fisher, the professor, and Droz agreed that there might have been a connection between Sirhan and Khoury, since Khoury worked at the hotel and because he had made anti-Kennedy remarks as a student. Fisher had been Khoury's political science professor at California State College at Fullerton in 1966 and 1967. Another witness who knew both Fisher and Khoury also reported seeing Khoury at the hotel the night of the shooting.

The investigation sought to establish some form of relationship between Khoury and Sirhan; however, no association was established. Khoury denied that he was at the hotel the night of June 4 or that he knew Sirhan. His unsubstantiated denial caused investigators to feel that there might have been some validity to the allegation.

The allegation was resolved when Khoury changed his original statement as to his whereabouts the night of June 4. He admitted



that he had been working at a second job as a security officer in Hollywood. This information was positively verified, and Khoury was completely cleared of complicity with Sirhan.

#### Estelle Stearns Investigation

Estelle Stearns was a volunteer worker at the Kennedy Campaign Headquarters on Wilshire Boulevard. On June 19, 1968, she reported to the Department that she had seen Sirhan at the headquarters prior to the assassination. She stated that she had a conversation with him and that Sirhan and another man with him were wearing guns. Allegedly Sirhan told her that they had permits for the guns.

Mrs. Stearns also related that after the assassination she received two phone calls, one the morning of the shooting telling her about the incident and the other threatening her if she told the police about her conversation with Sirhan on June 4.

The investigation of Sirhan's activities showed that he could not have been at the headquarters at the time that Mrs. Stearns alleged. Witnesses interviewed agreed that Mrs. Stearns was an eccentric old woman who would do whatever she could to bring attention upon herself. Other volunteer workers present on the 4th at the headquarters stated positively that Mrs. Stearns spoke to no one fitting Sirhan's description.

Mrs. Stearns was also one of the witnesses who reportedly saw Sirhan with Khaibar Khan. Witnesses revealed that Mrs. Stearns did speak to Khan on a few occasions but that she did not speak

to him on June 4. Mrs. Stearns was asked to take a polygraph but she refused. After complete refutation of her allegation, she still refused to admit that she was mistaken.

#### POSSIBLE INVOLVEMENT WITH EXTREMIST GROUPS

##### Jose Duarte Investigation

On June 11, 1968, an article about Sirhan appeared in two Orange County newspapers alleging that he had been present at a Peace and Freedom Party meeting on May 21, 1968, in Los Angeles. The articles referred to Jose Duarte, the leader of a Cuban anti-Castro group, who had allegedly become involved in an argument with Sirhan over Duarte's opposition to the Castro government in Cuba.

The meeting in question was attended by Duarte and several Cuban friends who intended to present opposing arguments to the featured speaker, a Castro sympathizer. Duarte became involved in an argument with a young male who disagreed with his remarks during the meeting; however, investigation revealed that the man was a Persian by the name of Reza Jalalipour. Jalalipour looked very much like Sirhan, and several persons remarked about the likeness. Witnesses, however, stated that Jalalipour was the person who argued with Duarte.

Several of Duarte's supporters who attended the meeting verified Duarte's account, but they subsequently qualified their statements. One of the Cubans present at the meeting with Duarte stated that Duarte was lying about the incident.

The investigation revealed that Jalilipour had attended the meeting and that he had signed a roster. Investigators confronted Jose Duarte with Jalalipour, and although he admitted the likeness, he denied that he had argued with him. Jalalipour stated that he had been the one who argued with Duarte at the meeting. Duarte's interest in furthering his political stature probably motivated him to make the claim that he made. When confronted with the facts, he stated, "I would rather die than lose face." Duarte subsequently took a polygraph examination which revealed that he was being untruthful. However, he refused to change his story.

#### Mike Vejvodda Investigation

On June 12, 1968, an informant for the Long Beach Police Department reported that she believed an acquaintance of hers, Michael Vejvodda, was involved with Sirhan in the assassination. She reported a conversation she had had with Vejvodda after the assassination of Martin Luther King. Vejvodda, who was allegedly involved in right-wing activities, was exhilarated over King's death. Vejvodda later related to the informant that something big was going to happen on June 2, 1968.

During another visit, sometime in May, 1968, Vejvodda allegedly told the informant that he had met a young man in Pasadena who "thought the way he did." The informant spoke with Vejvodda after Kennedy's assassination and he was very jubilant. The informant believed that Vejvodda and Sirhan were associated in some way because Vejvodda was a health addict. News releases after the assassination had revealed that Sirhan had worked in

a Pasadena health food store.

Vejvodda was arrested on June 19, 1968, by the San Diego Police for burglary. A large amount of weapons and property were found in a search of his apartment. The San Diego Police assisted this Department in the investigation of the Vejvodda allegation. Vejvodda denied any involvement in the assassination or that he knew Sirhan. He did state that he was not sorry that Kennedy was dead, and he admitted involvement with militant right-wing activities, although he denied membership in formal organizations. Vejvodda was given a polygraph examination which revealed that he was being truthful about his denial about any involvement in the assassination.

The investigation established that there was no known connection between Sirhan or Vejvodda. Investigators subsequently learned that the Long Beach informant occasionally made hysterical statements and that she was not considered completely reliable. It could not be determined why the informant believed that Vejvodda knew Sirhan.

#### Possible Association with Communists

The day following the assassination, a confidential and reliable informant reported that a man named Walter Crowe, Jr. had been talking about his old acquaintance with Sirhan. Crowe was subsequently interviewed, and he related that he might have influenced Sirhan's decision to kill Kennedy. The investigation of Crowe's background revealed that he was an admitted Communist who had gone to high school and junior college with Sirhan.

This information caused an intensive investigation to be conducted. The revelations by Mayor Samuel Yorty that Adel Sirhan's vehicle was observed parked near the Baces Hall in Los Angeles where left-wing meetings were held caused great public interest in Sirhan's possible involvement with Communist or left-wing organizations. There were also reports that the Southern California District Communist Party was greatly concerned that an association between Sirhan and the Communist Party might be created.

The allegation that Sirhan or his brother were attending such meetings at a location in Los Angeles was disproved when it was shown that Adel Sirhan had worked at The Fez Restaurant in Los Angeles near the meeting hall. He parked his vehicle in a parking lot near the hall but never attended the meetings.

The investigation into the relationship between Walter Crowe, Jr. and Sirhan remained open at the time of this report. It was determined that Crowe and Sirhan had been closely associated for several years while they were in school. Crowe related to investigators that he had spent the evening of May 2, 1968, at bars and restaurants in Pasadena with Sirhan. He stated that he had not seen Sirhan for a couple of years while he was attending U.C.L.A. and that his mother had encouraged him to visit Sirhan after the long period of not seeing him.

Crowe stated that at their meeting on May 2, 1968, they discussed Crowe's involvement with the Communist Party, and Sirhan talked about the Arab Terrorist Group "Al Fatah." Sirhan did not

respond to Crowe's enthusiasm about Communism and the subject was dropped. Crowe stated that because of this discussion he felt that Sirhan may have been encouraged to kill Kennedy. However, Crowe stated that he did not recall Sirhan mentioning that he was thinking of assassinating, shooting or killing anyone. He was not sure whether Kennedy's name was mentioned in some other context.

Crowe volunteered to take a polygraph examination, and he responded to twelve questions before requesting that the test be discontinued. He then stated that he wished to consult with an attorney before answering further questions. The examination revealed that Crowe had been untruthful on three crucial questions. Two of the questions had to do with Crowe's knowledge of whether Sirhan intended to shoot Kennedy. Crowe's response of "No" indicated that he was being untruthful. The results of this test caused investigators to believe that Crowe had some knowledge of Sirhan's intention to kill Kennedy; however, it was considered improbable that Crowe could have influenced Sirhan, based on the conversations described by Crowe.

A check of Crowe's background revealed that while attending U.C.L.A. he had become a Communist. He had also been involved in militant leftist activities while attending Pasadena City College. A check with Crowe's friends revealed that he was associated with several leftist students, which he had readily admitted.

A total of 148 persons, either known to Crowe or with left-wing

affiliations, were checked for association with Sirhan; however, no contact was established among them. Crowe was the only link between Sirhan and leftist associates, and the two had no known contact while Crowe attended U.C.L.A. between 1965 and 1968. To date no Communist or left-wing association has been established between Crowe or any of his associates and Sirhan.

#### POSSIBLE INVOLVEMENT WITH ARABIC GROUPS

##### The Fez Restaurant Investigation

There were two allegations involving The Fez Restaurant and Sirhan's activities there. Sirhan was alleged to have frequented The Fez and that he talked openly about politics and his political beliefs; and, secondly, he was alleged to have become angered by a female in The Fez and that he attacked her with a bottle.

Investigators interviewed the owners and employees of the restaurant and determined that both allegations regarding Sirhan were false. Through this investigation it was also determined that Sirhan had not attended left-wing meetings at the Baces Hall located near the restaurant.

It was determined that Sirhan's older brother, Adel, worked as a musician at the restaurant periodically in 1962 and 1967. He generally worked late hours and parked his vehicle, a Volkswagen, in a lot between the restaurant and the Baces Hall. Intelligence reports noting Adel Sirhan's vehicle at that location did not take into account his employment at the restaurant. He was never seen entering or exiting this vehicle. Witnesses involved in

the meetings which occurred at the Baces Hall denied that Adel or Sirhan Sirhan ever attended their meetings.

Witnesses who were interviewed regarding Sirhan's presence at the restaurant stated that Sirhan had only been in the restaurant on one or two occasions, and those times he remained quietly seated listening to his brother play the oud. It was believed that Sirhan accompanied his mother on one of the two occasions.

It was determined that the incident of the fight with a girl involved another man who closely resembled the Sirhan brothers. Mike Siam, a bartender at the restaurant, stated that the incident involved a female named Jamila Sellem and a man named Ahmad Yamni. Yamni became involved in an argument with Sellem, broke a bottle and attempted to strike her with it. No police report was made, and Siam prevented any injuries from occurring. Jamila Sellem stated that she recalled that the incident occurred sometime in late December 1967 or early January 1968. She stated that she could not positively identify her assailant.

Investigators concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that The Fez Restaurant provided the atmosphere for a conspiracy in the assassination or that Sirhan was involved in the activities at the restaurant.

#### Arab Student Groups

It was alleged that Sirhan was involved actively in Arab organizations while attending school. It was determined that Sirhan



was involved with one Arab group, but that there was no implication that his participation in Arab student activities affected his intent or attitude toward the assassination.

Kanan Abdul Latif Hamzeh stated that Sirhan was an active member of an organization called the "Organization of Arab Students in the United States of America and Canada." Hamzeh was the president of the Pasadena City College Chapter in 1965. The college chapter was not recognized by the parent organization in New York because Pasadena City College did not give the group formal status on campus. Hamzeh remarked that Sirhan appeared very interested in his school work and did not seem interested in politics. Hamzeh did feel that Sirhan could easily have been influenced by any Arab Nationalist cause because of his intense feelings against the Israelis.

The chairman of the Pasadena Chapter in 1968 had no recollection of Sirhan as a member. They described the group as a social organization. However, Sirhan did not belong to a group called "The International Club" on the Pasadena City College campus as was alleged, nor did he participate in any known Arab group activities at other schools in the Pasadena area.

An ex-postman alleged that Sirhan received pro-Nasser literature from an organization named the "Arab Student League." Investigators were unable to locate any record of such an organization. It was determined that the ex-postman was probably being hysterical about his recollections which were heightened by the revelation of Sirhan's involvement in the shooting. He had not

delivered mail to the Sirhan home for over one year.

Arab Pharmacist Sayegh

A witness, Mrs. Lois Garner, reported that on June 7, 1968, she overheard a conversation in a Temple City pharmacy which she believed to have had something to do with the assassination. The pharmacist, Mr. Spear S. Sayegh, was on the phone when Mrs. Garner entered his store. She overheard Sayegh state, "But I had to. We will call an emergency meeting. We must band together and stand behind him."

Investigators determined that Sayegh was active in the Southern California Arab community affairs. He did not recall the specific phone call that Garner referred to; however, he admitted that he had had several phone conversations with persons regarding defense arrangements for Sirhan. No evidence existed which could link Sayegh in a conspiracy with Sirhan.

CONSPIRACIES IMPLIED BY SIRHAN'S ACTIVITIES

Purchase of the Murder Weapon by Sirhan

When the investigation into the history of the murder weapon established that Munir Sirhan had purchased the weapon, the possibility that a conspiracy existed between Munir and Sirhan was raised. This aspect of the investigation remains open at this time. The District Attorney's Office has decided to delay the decision to determine whether any action should be taken regarding Munir's alien status and possible illegal possession of a weapon.

George Erhard identified Munir Sirhan as a co-employee whom he knew as "Joe," who had asked him if he had a handgun for sale. Both worked at Nash's Department Store in Pasadena, and it was known that Erhard collected guns. Erhard did not have the gun in January 1968 when Munir first asked him, but he was able to arrange the sale in February.

On the day of the sale, Munir Sirhan asked that Erhard meet him later that night when he would have the money. Erhard and a friend, William Price, met Munir who was with his brother, Sirhan Sirhan. Munir borrowed six dollars (\$6.00) from Sirhan and bought the gun.

Munir Sirhan denied that he had purchased the gun; he contended instead that Erhard had visited the Sirhan home and met Sirhan, who then arranged the sale of the gun. He submitted to a polygraph examination which indicated that he was being untruthful. The test indicated that Munir Sirhan had purchased the gun. He subsequently admitted that he lied about Erhard being in his home, but he refused to admit that he had purchased the gun. Investigators had no substantive evidence which linked the purchase of the gun by Munir with any guilty knowledge of Sirhan's intention to kill Kennedy.

#### Companion at Gun Shop

The search of Sirhan's vehicle after the shooting produced a sales receipt for .22 caliber ammunition sold by a gun shop in San Gabriel, California. The clerk identified as making the sale initially stated that he remembered making out the receipt

and that there were two other persons with the man who made the purchase. The sale took place sometime after 3:00 p.m. on June 1, 1968.. The salesman subsequently identified Sirhan as the man who purchased the ammunition. He could not identify one of the other men but tentatively identified Munir Sirhan as the third man.

The wife of the owner of the gun shop corroborated the statement of the salesman and stated that she recalled that the same men were in the shop sometime in April. She stated, however, that Sirhan spoke with a very distinctive foreign accent.

After a request to have the Sirhan brothers appear at a show up was ignored, investigators arranged a polygraph for the gun shop employees. Both the salesman and wife of the owner were found to be untruthful about their observations of Sirhan. As a result of the investigation, it was possible to determine only that Sirhan was in possession of a sales receipt for .22 caliber ammunition from the gun shop. The salesman subsequently admitted that he did not recall the sale or Sirhan; he could only state that he completed the sales receipt. The other witnesses stated that they were no longer sure of their statements.

#### San Gabriel Valley Gun Club Investigation

The investigation of Sirhan's activities prior to the assassination revealed that he had practiced shooting with the murder weapon at a shooting range in Duarte, California, on June 4, 1968.

It was alleged by the rangemaster, Everett Buckner, that he overheard Sirhan and a blond woman in a heated conversation which Buckner felt was conspiratorial in nature.

The investigation revealed that Sirhan arrived at the range alone at approximately 11:00 a.m. on June 4 and signed his name to the gun club roster. During the day he fired approximately 300 to 400 rounds from a .22 caliber revolver. He used rapid fire methods in firing and spoke to several other persons during the afternoon. He left by himself when the range closed at 5:00 p.m.

Buckner stated that Sirhan initially fired approximately 100 rounds and then returned to the control tower. He asked Buckner for .22 caliber ammunition that would not misfire. Sirhan then returned to the line where he continued firing. He then allegedly engaged in a conversation with a blond woman. Buckner overheard the woman state to Sirhan, "You son-of-a-bitch" or "Goddam you son-of-a-bitch, get away from me. They will recognize us." Shortly after that Sirhan disappeared.

The blond woman allegedly returned to the control tower where she met a tall man. The man stated to her, "Goddam it, you got to learn how to fire this gun today." The blond replied, "You're right." The investigation revealed that Buckner probably confused this incident with one involving a man and wife who came to the range at approximately 11:00 a.m. They had an argument over the gun the woman had just purchased, and a remark similar to the one heard by Buckner was probably made.

The man and woman recalled seeing Sirhan but did not speak to him.

A second couple came to the range at 4:00 p.m. They had a short argument about paying the range fee for only one hour of shooting. The woman, Claudia Williams, went to the pistol range and took a position near Sirhan and they conversed about their guns. They fired each other's gun and he commented on her gun. She described Sirhan as a very good shot and noted that the holes in his target were mostly in the center. Several other witnesses noted the same thing and commented on Sirhan's rapid firing.

The rangemaster's statement was refuted when he took a polygraph examination and responded untruthfully. Though initially he would not admit that he had been mistaken, his responses indicated that he had confused the incident with Sirhan's conversation with Claudia Williams at 4:00 p.m. and the argument which occurred at 11:00 a.m. between George Mioch and another woman. Buckner eventually admitted that he had been mistaken about the incident.

An additional witness at the range stated that he observed Sirhan on the rifle range with a rifle. This witness's statement completely conflicted with the numerous other witnesses. He was given a polygraph examination and responded truthfully to questions. It was concluded that the witness was honestly mistaken in his opinion of what he had seen. Of the thirty-seven persons interviewed, only the couple discussed above

thought they saw Sirhan on the rifle range. An unidentified person resembling Sirhan was seen on the rifle range by other witnesses.

The casings from the range for the period around June 4 were examined for evidential value; however, no identifiable casings could be found from the 37,815 examined. The investigation concluded that Sirhan was alone the entire day while at the range.

#### VOLUNTARY WITNESSES

##### Jerry Owen Investigation

Oliver Brindley Owen, aka Jerry Owen, was an ex-prize fighter turned minister who became involved in the most complicated allegation of conspiracy that developed in this investigation. The series of events allegedly involved Sirhan and Jerry Owen and the attempted purchase of a horse by Sirhan. The falsehood of Owen's allegation was clearly established through investigation of his claim.

Essentially Owen claimed that on Monday, June 3, 1968, at approximately 3:00 p.m., he picked up two hitchhikers in downtown Los Angeles and gave them a ride to the Hollywood-Wilshire area. Owen subsequently identified one of the hitchhikers as Sirhan who rode in the cab of his truck during part of the ride. Sirhan allegedly offered to buy a horse from Owen, who had a palomino for sale. The purchase was to be made at 11:00 p.m. that night at a location in Hollywood. Owen and Sirhan then allegedly met at this location at 11:00 p.m., and Sirhan asked Owen if he

could wait until the next day when he would have the necessary money. Owen registered at a local hotel for the night.

The next morning, June 4, Owen was met by a man in a flashy suit and a blond girl who told him that Sirhan did not have the money for the horse but that he wanted Owen to meet him again at 11:00 p.m. that night. The man offered to give him some money as part payment on the horse. The man also told Owen that there was something happening at the Ambassador Hotel that night and that he (the prospective buyer) could not have the money until then. Owen told the man that he could not meet him because of an appointment in Oxnard. Owen gave the man a business card and offered to bring the horse to Los Angeles the next day.

Owen then allegedly went to Oxnard, California, and remained there the night of June 4. He returned to Los Angeles at approximately 12:30 p.m. on the 5th and learned of the assassination. He told two friends of the incident after allegedly recognizing a picture of Sirhan in a newspaper and went to University Station where he made his statement to the Department.

During the ensuing months investigators sought to conclusively establish the truth regarding Owen's allegation. On the surface his statements were not self-incriminating, and Owen presented himself as a volunteer witness who was interested in assisting the police. Essentially investigators needed only to establish the falsity of Owen's statements to refute his allegation or to verify the truth of his statements and use Owen



as a material witness. All evidence seemed to indicate that Sirhan was not with Owen on the 3rd. It was necessary, however, for investigators to determine Owen's reasons for fabricating the incident or whether he was honestly mistaken.

A complication developed early in the investigation when Jerry Owen became wary about the investigation of his allegation. Owen allegedly received a threatening phone call on June 6, 1968, telling him to remain quiet regarding his horse deal with Sirhan. Owen moved to the San Francisco area where he remained "in hiding" for several months. During that time his allegation became publicized, and Owen engaged an attorney, George T. Davis, to represent him.

A polygraph examination was arranged for Owen on July 3, 1968, at the San Francisco Police Department. His attorney, Davis, was present during the test. Owen's responses to key questions indicated that he was being untruthful. When told of the results of the test, Owen made a lengthy statement which indicated that he was unsure of his original statement.

Investigators subsequently interviewed Mrs. Mary Sirhan and Adel Sirhan who attempted to assist investigators in determining the truth of Owen's allegations. After a visit with Sirhan at the Hall of Justice, Mrs. Sirhan told investigators that Sirhan had denied knowing anything about Jerry Owen or the purchase of a horse.

At this point in the investigation there had been three separate accounts of the occurrence given by Owen. The number of

inconsistencies which appeared between the accounts and the results of the polygraph, coupled with Sirhan's denial of knowing Owen, led investigators to the conclusion that Owen was lying. It remained for investigators to determine why and to firmly refute Owen's statements with factual information and physical evidence.

An investigation was made into Owen's description of the events occurring on June 3. Several discrepancies appeared in his statements, and witnesses who were interviewed stated that Owen did not do all of the things that he said he had done. Owen stated that he went to a sporting goods store and purchased a pair of boxing shoes. A witness, Rip O'Reilly, stated that Owen did not buy the shoes that day; other witnesses also tended to refute Owen's statements. O'Reilly also stated that he was with Owen until 11:30 p.m. that night when Owen contended that he had been with Sirhan at 11:00 p.m. These and other discrepancies tended to refute Owen's allegation.

In early August 1968, Jonn G. Christian, a newspaper writer, and William Turner, an ex-F.B.I. agent turned free lance writer, entered into the Owen investigation. Christian contacted this Department offering his assistance, and he suggested that he would like to be deputized to work with the Department. Christian had a taped account of Owen's story. He told investigators that he believed Sirhan and Owen were together on June 4 and that they conspired to assassinate Kennedy. Christian further alleged that Owen was involved in Sirhan's escape plans,

and after the aborted escape, Owen was trying to establish an alibi with his horse-selling story.

Christian subsequently wrote a letter to this Department which outlined his reasons for believing that Owen was involved in the assassination. By enumerating various conflicts in Owen's accounts of the incident, he hypothesized that Owen's reasons for lying were that he was involved in the conspiracy and seeking a means to avoid association with Sirhan. Christian subsequently sought to establish a link in Owen's background with Dr. Carl MacIntyre, a minister whose name had been linked through the investigation of New Orleans District Attorney James Garrison.

Investigators, attacking the inconsistencies in Owen's account, also concluded that he was lying; however, there was no evidence to indicate that Owen was involved with an extremist group or with Sirhan.

#### The Virginia Teresi Investigation

Mrs. Virginia Teresi voluntarily contacted this Department on June 5, 1968, with an account of an incident allegedly involving Sirhan. She stated that she observed Sirhan and the two other men in a vehicle near Melrose Avenue and St. Andrews Place in Los Angeles. She allegedly overheard Sirhan state to one of the others, "Get your ass in the car, we have to get him tonight." As the vehicle drove away, the men stared at Teresi and she observed two rifles leaning against the back seat. She also had observed one of the men wearing a holster with a gun.

During the lengthy investigation which took place, Mrs. Teresi was reinterviewed several times. She revealed that she had received a written and telephonic threat regarding her knowledge of the incident. Based on various inconsistencies in her statements, a polygraph examination was arranged for Teresi. She failed to respond truthfully to questions, and in a post-examination interview she admitted fabricating the story. Her reason was that she wanted to insure that the investigation into the assassination would be complete. Mrs. Teresi's background indicated a history of attempted suicide and emotional disturbance.

#### The Golden Garter Inn Investigation

The owners of a beer bar in Alhambra, California, alleged that Sirhan was a regular customer of the bar and that on occasion he was overheard to have made a threatening statement regarding Kennedy a few weeks prior to the assassination.

The conversation allegedly took place between a patron, James Wilson, and Sirhan. The owner of the bar overheard an argument between the men and after hearing the man with Wilson say, "We'll get him when he comes to Los Angeles," Wilson stated, "Cool it, cool it." The witness identified Sirhan from a set of look-alike photographs.

The investigation was resolved when James Wilson indicated that the man in question was named Bob Andrese. Investigators noted the strong resemblance between Sirhan and Andrese. The witnesses who had been in the bar agreed that Bob Andrese was the man in

the bar with Wilson. The argument in question was a political discussion in which Andrese became excited. Wilson was attempting to calm Andrese when the conversation was overheard. Kennedy was not the subject of the discussion. The witnesses who had tentatively identified Sirhan admitted that they were not positive of their identification.

#### John Gearhart Investigation

Subsequent to the announcement of Sirhan's arrest, John Gearhart voluntarily told the Department about his observation of Sirhan in a beer bar in Glendora, California, the night of the shooting. He stated he was at the beer bar at 9:30 p.m. and that he sat next to a young Cuban or Italian man. Gearhart stated, "I hope McCarthy wipes out Kennedy." The young man replied, "You don't have to worry, we have taken care of that." The young man stated, after Gearhart introduced himself, "My name is Sirhan Bishara Sirhan."

Gearhart alleged that Sirhan was with two young females and two other males who arrived a little after he did. After dancing with one of the girls he left the bar. The two men and women followed him outside. One of the men asked him why he had danced with his girl, and Gearhart feigned drunkenness to avoid a problem. The man did not bother him and one of them stated, "We have to go back and pick up Sirhan. It's getting late, we have a party to go to in Los Angeles." Gearhart found the purse of one of the women in his vehicle the next day and took it back to the bar.

Gearhart was shown a set of photographs but he could not select one of Sirhan. The investigation revealed that Gearhart was lying about the incident. It was independently proven that Sirhan was at another location at the time that Gearhart alleged that he talked to him.

It was disclosed that Gearhart was involved in an incident at the bar, but it occurred on another date which could not be recalled by witnesses. The woman's purse belonged to a woman named Delores Licon who went to the bar with some friends one night after attending the fights at the Olympic Auditorium.

Licon recalled that Gearhart was at the bar and drunk. She and her friends took Gearhart to a drug store for some coffee. She recalled that they assisted him to his vehicle where she accidentally left her purse. She picked up the purse at the bar the next day. The witnesses stated that Sirhan was not present during this incident.

Gearhart subsequently was shown to have been untruthful when he was given a polygraph examination. He stated later that his reason for fabricating the story was that he was trying to show that he was a good citizen and offer something to his country.

#### Biltmore Hotel Investigation

An information clerk at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles advised the Department that she had observed Sirhan's name on a hotel registration card for June 1, 1968. She stated that after the assassination the hotel management removed all records of

Sirhan's stay at the hotel. The clerk's statement was substantiated by another employee who stated that she recalled giving Sirhan the key to his room. She further recalled seeing Sirhan with another man who was sending a telegram. The telegram allegedly read "Arrived from Baghdad."

The investigation concluded that Sirhan was not at the hotel. The hotel management denied that they had told employees to suppress such information, and they showed investigators the hotel registration which is recorded on a continuous roll. The record had no entry for Sirhan, and there were no cuts, splices or alterations to the roll. A hotel telephone operator recalled that the information clerk had shown her a registration card with an unusual sounding name. She stated that the name definitely was not Sirhan Sirhan. The writer of the telegram was identified, and it was determined that he was connected in no way with Sirhan. The two hotel employees would not change their original stories, and it could not be determined what prompted their actions.

#### John Fahey Investigation

John Fahey was the subject of an intensive investigation after he reported that he had met a woman, prior to the assassination, who asked him to help her and told him that the assassination would occur. Fahey allegedly gave the woman a ride to the Oxnard area, and they were followed by a man in a Volkswagen who threatened Fahey. The woman had told him that she was involved with a group who were planning to "take care of"

Senator Kennedy.

Fahey subsequently identified Sirhan Sirhan and Munir Sirhan as being the two men whom the woman had referred to as part of the group. Fahey alleged that he first met the woman at the Ambassador Hotel where he also observed Sirhan. The incident allegedly occurred on June 4, 1968, between 9:00 a.m. and 7:30 p.m. Fahey stated that after arriving in Oxnard he bought the woman dinner and returned her to Los Angeles. He resolved not to become involved in the woman's problem, but after the assassination he felt compelled to report the incident.

Investigators examined the details of Fahey's account in an effort to determine the validity of his statement. Based on Fahey's subsequent statements, several discrepancies appeared in his story. Additionally, he reported that after the assassination he was followed by one of the vehicles that had followed him and the woman on June 4.

Fahey's employer reported that Fahey had told him of the incident including an additional detail which described the man who looked like Munir Sirhan as having a gun when he threatened him. Fahey's employer described Fahey as being a poor employee whose employment record was very unstable. Fahey denied that he had told his employer about a gun.

During the investigation John Fahey became involved with a newspaper writer, Fernando Faura, who publicized Fahey's account. Faura wrote an article in the Hollywood Citizen News about the



Fahey allegation. Fahey subsequently told investigators that he worried about the things that Faura told him. Faura's official manner toward Fahey gave him the impression that he worked with the police. Faura used the San Fernando Police Station facility to interview Fahey. Fahey later agreed to allow Faura to arrange a private polygraph operator to test him and for a hypnotist to hypnotize him. The polygraph operator gave a tentative opinion that Fahey was telling the truth. Fahey attended one session with a hypnotist but refused to appear for his own scheduled hypnosis.

Fahey's allegation was riddled with contradictions, and in several instances investigators disproved elements of his statements. It was proven that Munir Sirhan worked the entire day the incident was to have occurred. It was also proven that Fahey made business calls in the Oxnard area when he claimed he had not. Witnesses at locations which Fahey stated he had been with the woman denied that the two were ever there.

Fahey submitted to a polygraph examination on September 5, 1968. The test strongly indicated that he was being untruthful. Fahey subsequently admitted that he had falsified his story. He had elaborated on certain events which had occurred but which were not related to the assassination. Fahey would not accept responsibility for his actions; instead, he stated that he believed that Faura had strongly influenced him into thinking that what he had told the police was true.

James Hoffa, Jr.

Mrs. Anita Stewart, a young housewife whose father, Leonard Davis, was an official of the Teamster's Union, alleged that she was present at a meeting at which she thought she overheard comments about Senator Kennedy. She believed that James Hoffa, Jr., the son of the imprisoned union president, had been present at the meeting. The comments were to the effect that if Kennedy were elected president, he would be "rubbed out." She stated that the subject of Kennedy's harassment of James Hoffa came up during the meeting. The meeting occurred sometime in July 1967.

Mrs. Stewart also implied that the men at this meeting discussed a man who had "opened his mouth" to authorities. Another man at the meeting circled the Encino area on a map. The next day she heard on the news of a car bombing in Encino.

Finally, she alleged that on June 5, 1968, she received a telephone call at 4:00 a.m. A man stated to her, "Forget everything you heard in Lennie's office, or you won't live to tell about it."

The initial identification of Hoffa by Stewart was not positive, and interviews with those present at the meeting revealed that James Hoffa, Jr. was not present at the meeting. James Hoffa, Jr. himself denied that he was at such a meeting.

Stewart's father, Leonard Davis, was present at the meeting, and he verified that his daughter was present. He completely refuted her allegations and stated that his daughter was a pathological

liar and that she needed psychiatric care.

Several inconsistencies which appeared in Stewart's allegation tended to also disprove her allegations. Coupled with the denials of those present at the meeting, investigators discounted her allegation. It was concluded that there was no connection between the Kennedy assassination and the alleged meeting. The reasons for Stewart's making the allegation could not be determined.

#### MISCELLANEOUS INCIDENTS

##### Antoine Fouad Khoury

In November 1968, the Department was advised that a young Glendale, California, girl had reported knowing a man who was attending some sort of meetings at the Sirhan home. The young girl stated to investigators that a girl friend of hers had been dating a man named Antoine Khoury, who had taken this girl to a house in Pasadena where Arabic was spoken. The other girl, Miss Candace Green, admitted that she had dated Khoury and that she had accompanied him to the home of two older women in Pasadena. She said that she had never met any of the Sirhans, nor were they at the house she visited.

Antoine Khoury denied that he had taken Green to the Sirhan house although he admitted meeting Saidallah Sirhan at the home of another friend about six months prior to the assassination. Khoury was not involved in any Arab community affairs and was not connected with the assassination in any way. The story of

the two girls was just plausible enough for them to create an interesting story which the father of one of the girls thought should be related to the police.

#### Incident at San Fernando Valley College

On May 15, 1968, Valley Services Division received a telephone bomb threat relating to a scheduled appearance of Senator Kennedy at Valley College. A team of Van Nuys Division officers were sent to the location to provide necessary security at the event.

No bomb incident developed; however, derogatory remarks were directed at the officers by the crowd, and the Kennedy staff asked the officers in rather crude terms to allow the crowd all the freedom they wanted. The only incident involving Kennedy's safety occurred when a small object was reported to have struck him on the forehead. An officer saw the object and reported that it was possibly a flashbulb.

#### Middle Eastern News Release

Mr. Max Berman reported to the Department that while on tour in Israel on May 18, 1968, he was told by a hotel employee that Senator Kennedy had been shot. This information had been allegedly heard on a British Broadcasting Corporation French language broadcast. Several other witnesses reported hearing of the shooting incident; however, those reporting all received the information secondhand.

Investigation revealed that BBC could not find evidence of the

broadcast; however, it was learned that the Reuter's News Agency had teleprinted a story on May 16, 1968, regarding a "stone-throwing" incident which had occurred in Los Angeles at Valley College. In all probability the incident in question is the crowd control incident which occurred on May 15, 1968. Frank Mankiewicz, Kennedy's press secretary, advised investigators that a flashbulb had fallen near Kennedy on that date, but he was not injured in any way during the day.

Harold Weisberg

On June 19, 1968, a KHJ television executive producer was contacted by a writer named Harold Weisberg who stated that he had been given information that persons had known that there would be an attempt on Senator Kennedy's life prior to the assassination. He referred to an informant who had told him that the Kennedy "camp" had been warned that an attempt would be made on Kennedy's life in California and that it would take place in a crowd.

Weisberg refused to identify his informant after relating the same story to this Department on June 27, 1968. He advised investigators that he was writing a book about the John F. Kennedy assassination and that he had discussed his information with New Orleans District Attorney James Garrison. Weisberg repeatedly asked the investigators to arrange some paid television interviews for him in the Los Angeles area, as he was without funds. Because Weisberg refused to identify his informant and was generally reluctant to give further details,

the investigation was suspended pending new developments.

Corona Check Investigation

On December 5, 1968, a report was publicized that Sirhan was involved in a stolen and forged check investigation from Corona, California. The incident, which occurred in 1966, involved a check made out to Sirhan which was stolen from the ranch where he had worked in Corona. A co-employee had stolen the check, forged it and cashed it at a Corona grocery store. A stop payment had been placed on the check when it was reported missing.

The suspect in the theft was identified during this investigation, and the Corona Police Department has reopened the case. The press was notified that Sirhan had not been involved in the theft of the stolen check.

## CASE PREPARATION FOR TRI

A three-man Case Preparation Team under the direction of a lieutenant was established within Special Unit Senator on June 12, 1968. Their primary duties were the interviewing of potential trial witnesses, the evaluation and preservation of evidence and the development of the Department's part in the prosecution of Sirhan.

Initially they worked with the 127 interviews and the items booked into evidence by Rampart Detectives between June 5 and June 11. A complete evaluation was made of the available statements and evidence, and a special locked evidence room was located in Room 803 of Parker Center.

They were also responsible for maintaining close liaison with the District Attorney's Office generally through weekly and often daily meetings. The investigators provided the prosecuting attorneys with an evaluation of potential witnesses and reinvestigated matters which the prosecution felt required it.

Several innovative techniques involving the application of charts were used in the investigation, at first experimentally, then as a valid tool as their administrative and investigative value became apparent. A PERT chart, while of limited investigative value, resulted in several time-based charts. These charts depicted a profile analysis of Sirhan from 1957 to 1968, an hourly log of his activities for the three days prior to the assassination and a parallel time comparison chart illustrating the activities of Kennedy and Sirhan. These charts were of

great value as a reference as well as emphasizing areas in need of further investigative attention.

As an aid to the investigation, a twenty-minute sound movie was produced from the available television, news and private film made just prior to, during and after the shooting. The shooting scene itself was photographed and the locations of witnesses and other victims were marked with chalk for identification. Scale models were constructed of the hotel and the pantry area and schematic drawings of the same locations were made for the same purpose.

On November 12 through 15, 1968, anticipated trial witnesses appeared at the Ambassador Hotel for reenactment of the shooting. The twenty-minute sound movie condensed from news media footage was utilized to assist witnesses in recalling their exact location at the time of the shooting. Photographs were taken as each witness placed himself in position.

Evaluation and selection of witnesses for trial was completed by Case Preparation Team with the District Attorney's Office responsible for the final decision as to which witnesses would be used at the trial.

The group of witnesses most important to the prosecution were the seventy persons in the pantry at the time of the shooting. Five of those standing closest to Kennedy would be used for describing the shooting. Several others would be used to describe Sirhan's actions just prior to and after the shooting.



Witnesses who could establish premeditation were evaluated for their potential value as trial witnesses. Those witnesses would be called who could testify to Sirhan's shooting practice at the San Gabriel Gun Club, his presence during the purchase of the murder weapon by Munir Sirhan and his purchase of ammunition at a gun shop. A Pasadena trash collector would be called to testify to statements made by Sirhan that he intended to kill Kennedy.

A witness who observed Sirhan at a Kennedy Rally at the Ambassador Hotel on June 2, 1968, would be called to show that Sirhan may have attempted to get to Kennedy on more than one occasion. A District Attorney's Office handwriting expert would be called to identify Sirhan's handwriting in various notebooks taken from Sirhan's home.

The officers involved in the arrest, various searches and the custody of Sirhan were advised to be prepared to testify. The doctors and nurses who treated Kennedy and the other victims were also advised regarding the decision to have them testify. The Central Jail doctor who treated Sirhan was similarly advised.

## INVESTIGATION OF PREMEDITATION

### The Assassination Weapon

The gun used by Sirhan to kill Robert Kennedy was an Iver Johnson, .22 caliber, Cadet Model, two-and-one-half inch barrel, blue steel finish, with dark brown plastic grips, serial #H53725. The gun was manufactured in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, and was originally sold by the Pasadena Gun Shop on August 10, 1965.

The tracing of the ownership of the gun established that Sirhan Sirhan was present during the sale of the gun to his brother, Munir Sirhan, by George Erhard, a co-employee of Munir Sirhan. A second witness confirmed that Sirhan loaned his brother \$6 toward the purchase of the gun. The weapon was purchased in February 1968, four months prior to the assassination.

### Purchase of Ammunition

The search of Sirhan's vehicle yielded a receipt for the purchase of .22 caliber ammunition from a gun shop in San Gabriel, California. The sale took place on June 1, 1968, in the late afternoon just after Sirhan practiced shooting at the Corona Police Range. The salesman initially alleged that Sirhan was accompanied by two other men when the sale was made; however, this allegation was proven to have been false and the salesman retracted his statement, indicating that all he actually knew was that he made out the sales receipt.

### Sirhan's Practice at the Range

On June 5, 1968, a member of the San Gabriel Valley Gun Club recognized Sirhan's picture and recalled that he had observed him firing a small revolver on the San Gabriel Range on June 4, 1968. He told the club president who checked the range roster and discovered Sirhan's name and address.

The investigation revealed that Sirhan arrived at the range between 11:00 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. He took a position alone at the west end of the pistol range. Witnesses reported that he was firing a .22 caliber pistol with a short barrel. One witness spoke to Sirhan at approximately 2:30 p.m. and they discussed hunting. He fired Sirhan's gun and described it as a cheap model.

A husband and wife were at the range late in the afternoon. The woman was on the pistol range and having trouble hitting her target. She asked Sirhan to show her the proper methods of sighting. He gestured with his hands pointing at the rear and front sights and took her arm to show her the proper stance. He fired eighteen shots from her weapon and she fired sixteen from his.

Other witnesses reported that Sirhan used rapid fire methods to fire his gun and that he was an excellent shot. Several hundred rounds were fired by Sirhan, and the center of his target was torn out. Several witnesses commented that Sirhan

discussed the hollow point as inflicting greater damage than the .22 caliber long rifle.

Sirhan came and left the range alone and was there from 11 a.m. until about 5 p.m., when the range closed. He purchased some .22 caliber hollow points from the rangemaster. Approximately forty pounds of shell casings were taken from the range and examined by the F.B.I. and the Department. The results of the tests were negative, no comparisons could be established between these casings and those found in the murder weapon.

#### Practice at The Corona Range

Investigation in early December, 1968, disclosed that Sirhan had practiced with a revolver on the Corona Police Pistol Range on June 1, 1968, three days prior to the assassination. The sign-in sheet indicated that he came to the range at approximately 12:15 p.m. and left at approximately 3 p.m. It was determined that he went from the Corona Range to the Lock, Stock 'N Barrel Gun Shop in San Gabriel where he purchased some ammunition.

Discovery that Sirhan had been at the range came on December 13, 1968, when investigators were in Corona, California, investigating a report that Sirhan had been involved in a 1966 check theft in that city. The investigation revealed that Sirhan had not been involved in the stolen check case, but while investigators were at the Corona Police Department, they checked the police range roster and discovered Sirhan's signature on the page for June 1, 1968. Handwriting analysis

confirmed that the signature was made by Sirhan. Due to the lapse of time from the time of the incident, most witnesses at the range on that date could not recall Sirhan's presence. The rangemaster did select a photograph of Sirhan from a set of look-alikes; however, he described Sirhan as being 6'-6'2" and weighing 215-225 pounds. Investigators concluded that the witness was mistaken, due to the lapse of time between the date of the occurrence and the time of the interview.

#### Evidence from Sirhan's House

The papers, notes and notebooks found in Sirhan's bedroom on June 5, 1968, were transported to the F.B.I. laboratory for comparison, then returned to the Los Angeles Police Department laboratory. These writings included statements such as "R.F.K. must die" and "Robert F. Kennedy must be assassinated before 5 June 68." L. W. Sloan, Questioned Documents Examiner from the District Attorney's Office, formed the opinion that Sirhan had written 90% of the writings in the notebooks. He based his opinion on intercomparisons of Sirhan's signature which appeared on several documents, including the San Gabriel Gun Club roster, an application for a "hot walkers" license to the State of California and the canceled check signed by Sirhan from the Argonaut Insurance Company.

#### Evidence from Sirhan's Vehicle

The search of Sirhan's vehicle disclosed twenty-five items, some of which assisted in showing premeditation. The sales slip from Lock, Stock 'N Barrel Gun Shop in San Gabriel had one of Sirhan's fingerprints on it. A sales receipt from an auto

parts shop contained one identifiable fingerprint of Sirhan's. Seven prints were taken from various parts of the vehicle, six were identified as Sirhan's and one was unidentifiable. The evidence established Sirhan's ownership of the 1956 De Soto, license number JWS 093, and that he had been in the vehicle at a time shortly before the assassination.

Witness to Sirhan's Intention to Kill Kennedy

Alvin Clark, a trash collector for the City of Pasadena, advised investigators of several conversations he had with Sirhan in 1967 and 1968. They generally spoke of current events, and on April 10, 1968, Sirhan asked Clark for whom he was voting. When Clark told him, "Kennedy," Sirhan replied, "Well, I don't agree. I am planning on shooting the son-of-a-bitch." Clark did not take him seriously. They subsequently discussed guns and hunting, and Sirhan asked Clark where he might obtain a weapon greater in caliber than his .22 pistol.

In addition to Clark's statement, investigators had the writings of Sirhan himself to show his intention to kill Kennedy. Writings in his notebooks were examined, and the examiner's opinion was that they were written by Sirhan. One passage states, "My determination to eliminate R.F.K. is becoming more the more of an unshakable obsession." Written over and over on several pages was "R.F.K. must be assassinated." On another page he wrote "Sirhan Sirhan must begin to work on uphold solving the problems and difficulties of assassinating the 36th president of the glorious United States." On still another page, "Kennedy must fall. Kennedy must fall" and "We believe

that Robert F. Kennedy must be sacrificed for the cause of the poor exploited people."

Evidence of Prior Contacts with Kennedy

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sheehan, attending a Sports Arena rally for Kennedy on May 24, 1968, reported seeing Sirhan at approximately 10:30 p.m. at the end of the rally. The man described Sirhan as "completely out of character with the crowd" in that he "appeared very intense and sinister."

Another witness, William Blume, at one time worked next door to the health food store where Sirhan worked in Pasadena. He positively identified Sirhan as being at a Kennedy Rally on June 2, 1968, at the Ambassador Hotel. The time was between 8:30 and 10:30 p.m.

Sirhan's State of Mind - After his Arrest

Immediately after his arrest it was noted that Sirhan appeared apprehensive about the crowd reaction to him. Once in custody, however, it was noted that he was especially calm and collected. His only responses to questions regarding the shooting were noncommittal or carefully phrased.

During the apprehension Rafer Johnson asked him, "Why did you do it?" Sirhan replied, "I can explain" or "I'll tell you later." Jesse Unruh recalled that Sirhan stated at one time, "I did it for my country."

Sirhan would not discuss personal matters with those who attempted to engage him in trivial conversation. When.

investigators were interviewing him to determine his identity, Sirhan openly discussed several matters but not the shooting. He refused to identify himself.

During the booking process it was noted that Sirhan cared a great deal about his appearance and that he took a long, leisurely shower. The jailer, seated in his cell, recalled that he made two comments which were personal. He said that he "got nothing out of life" and "they won't give it to me."

An investigator who interviewed him gave the opinion that Sirhan was in good spirits and quite stimulated. He acted as if he were playing a game and enjoying it. He appeared anxious to match wits with the investigators. When investigators located a 1968 Chrysler, incorrectly believed to be Sirhan's vehicle, Sirhan commented, "How did you know it was a 1958 Chrysler? The key? Beautiful." It was the investigator's opinion that Sirhan fancied himself something of an intellectual.



## LEGAL PROCESSES

On June 5, 1968, at 7:08 a.m., Sirhan was arraigned in Division 40, Los Angeles Municipal Court by Judge Joan Dempsey Klein. Sirhan identified himself as John Doe and was represented by the Public Defender's Office. Bail was set at \$250,000 for six counts of 217 P.C., Assault with Intent to Commit Murder.

On June 7, 1968, at 9 a.m., the County Grand Jury met and returned a murder indictment against Sirhan. Twenty-three witnesses were called to testify. At 4:25 p.m., the indictment was taken before Judge Arthur Alarcon in Department 100 of the Superior Court who ordered a bench warrant be issued with no bail.

The court reconvened in a temporary courtroom provided at the Los Angeles County Central Jail. This measure was taken to provide security for Sirhan. Sirhan was informed of the indictment returned against him and he informed the court that he did not have the funds to hire an attorney. The Public Defender was appointed to defend Sirhan. Sirhan's defense advised the court that he was not ready to enter a plea and a delay was granted until June 28, 1968.

Judge Alarcon then appointed two psychiatrists at the request of the defense. He also issued a court order prohibiting parties connected with the case from making extra judiciary statements. A. L. Wirin, of the American Civil Liberties Union, commented favorably on the actions of the participants in their efforts to protect Sirhan's rights.

At 9 a.m., in the auditorium of the County Central Jail, with Russell Parsons representing Sirhan, a three week continuance was requested for more time to prepare a plea. A new psychiatrist was substituted for one who had declined the first request. The case was continued until July 19.

At that hearing Parsons indicated that the defendant was not ready to plead since the doctors had not completed their psychiatric reports. District Attorney Younger made a motion to vacate or modify the order concerning publicity. A continuance was granted until August 2, 1968.

On August 2, Judge Richard Schauer extended the Alarcon Admonition but allowed that statements in the public interest or in the defendants interest could be made. Sirhan entered a plea of Not Guilty and a trial date of November 1, 1968, was set. Proceedings were continued to October 4, 1968.

On September 25, 1968, the California State Court of Appeals denied Younger's appeal to vacate the Alarcon Admonition. On September 19, Judge Schauer selected Judge Herbert V. Walker as the Trial Magistrate; Department 107, Room 832, Hall of Justice was selected as the courtroom. On October 4, Judge Schauer set October 14, as the date for a hearing on a motion to suppress evidence.

On that date Judge Walker granted a defense motion for discovery and all statements and other items of evidence were surrendered by the District Attorney's Office. A motion to continue the trial date to December 9, 1968, was granted. The motion to