MAPE THEM PAROLE CONSIDERATION HEARING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMUNITY RELEASE BOARD

CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL FACILITY

VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1979

2:15 P.M.

In the Matter of the Subsequent Parole Consideration of

GROGAN, STEVE.

CDC No. B-38773

.

5

10

11

12

14

15

16

17 18

t9

20

21

22

23 24

25

FRANCES ANN PETERSON

C.S.R. LIČENSE NO. 4379

PETERS BICOVALAND REPORTING CENTORATION

3 Tall and 10 10 00 1401

1

6

members presen	_

i,i

N.

R. Brown, Board Mumber

L. Colling, Board Member

A. S. Vinegard, Hearing Representative

ALSO PRESENT

Stete Grogan, Inmate

Diana Samuelson, Ateorney for Inmate Grogan

James J. Shea, Los Argeles County District Attorney's Office

15 16

11

12

13

14

17 18

19,

20

21 22

23

24

25

PETERS CHOSTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

٠.٠			·
			iii
1	INDEX		
2		Page	
3	Proceedings	1	
4	. Case Fagtors	_	, '
5 .		٠	٠.
_	Pre-commitment Factors	32	
6	Post-commitment Factors	41	. ,
7	Release Plans	97	•
8	Recess	116	. , ,
9	Resumption of Proceedings for	117	
。	Finding of the Board	•	-
,	Adjournment	124	
İ	Certificate of Reporter	125	
2	A Market Commencer of the Commencer of t		
3			-
4			
5			
6			
, [
8			
,			,
		•	
'			ئ
!		. :	*
1			
֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓			
1		* *	•
			.'
1		•	

I ROCEELNES

---000---

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: This is a subsequent parole consideration hearing for a life term prisoner whose name is Steve Grogan, G-r-o-g-a-n, B-38773. The hearing is being conducted at the Correctional Medical Facility in Vacaville on October 17th, 1979. And the time is now approximately 2:15 p.m.

Present in the room are the following persons:

My name is Ray Brown. I'm a Member of the Community Release
Board. I will be presiding at the hearing today. On my
right is Mrs. Loretta Collier, who is also a Member of the
Community Release Board. And to her right is Mr. Austin
Vineyard, who is a Hearing Representative for the Community
Release Board. At the end of the table and to my left is
Mr. James Shea, who is a member of the Los Angeles County
District Attorney's Office. The inmate is present in the
hearing room. And the inmate's attorney is Diana Samuelson.

Ť

The hearing is being conducted pursuant to Penal Code Sections 3041, 3042, and the regulations of the Community Release Board governing parole consideration hearings for life prisoners. The purpose of today's hearing is to determine your suitability for parole. It is necessary for us to conduct this hearing under revised procedures enacted by the Legislature which became effective on July 1st

197%; and they were amended again in July of 1978, and which apply to all prisoners under a life sentence.

of the crimes far which you were committed to state prison, your criminal history or lack of it prior to this commitment, and your behavior since your commitment. We will reach a decision and inform you whether you are suitable for parole or not and why, and if you are found suitable, the length of your confinement and the specific factors leading to this determination. I will tell you at the outset that nothing we do here today can become final until 60 days have elapsed. It is a provision of the Penal Code. The decision is tentative for a period of 60 days. At the conclusion of the hearing we will give you a copy of the document that shows you what the tentative decision is in this case. I would also state that the notices required by 3042 of the Penal Code have been sent in this particular case.

There is no confidential information being used at the hearing today. The decision we make today will be based on the information that is available to you and to your counsel.

The hearing is divided up essentially into four parts. The first part is a discussion of the commitment offense itself. The second part is a discussion of your prior criminal history. The third part is a discussion of

your institution adjustment. And the last part is a discussion of your parole plans that you may have. You are free to participate in any or all parts of the discussion today. If you're going to testify, why, we're going to place you under oath. And if a decision has been made, we'll do that at this time.

MS. SAMUELSON: Yes.

10

- 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

34

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Do you want to rise and . raise your right hand.

(Thereupon Inmate Grogan was, by Presiding (Member Brown, sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.)

INMATE GROGAN: I do.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Fine. Be seated.

You're entitled to certain rights. We will discuss those at this time. The first is that you have had sufficient time to prepare for the hearing today and to discuss the case with your counsel. And you are in fact ready to proceed with the hearing today?

MS. SAMUELSON: Yes.

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Have you had a chance to review your C File?

INMATE GROGAN: Yes.

PRESEDENG MEMBER BROWN: Chay. And do you or your

counsel have any reason to feel that any member of this panel cannot give you an impartial hearing?

INMATE GROGAN: (Inmate shakes head.)

MS. SAKUELSON: No. The only thing I noted about the composition of the Board today was that there wasn't a person from last year's panel. And I don't know whether that's still a rule or not.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: If possible.

MS. SAMUELSON: Okay.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And there isn't in this particular case.

At this time I would hear any preliminary objections you may have to the hearing, Counsel.

MS. SAMUELSON: At this time we don't have any preliminary objections.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: All right. We will then note and enter into the record two documents. One is Document Number I, which is a list of the documents we have been reviewing prior to your coming into the room. There is one error on this document — I will show it to you. Counsel. The one with the red line, it shows that there is a transcript of last year's parole consideration hearing in the file. There is none, and we have not seen it.

MS. SAMUELSON: Oh, well, I have an extra copy.

Would you like it?

10

Ŧ1

<u>` 12</u>

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23,

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: We'll see as we go along if we need it.

- 5

Other than that, those are the documents. If yo will pass that over to the District Attorney when you're through, and we can come to an agreement that these are the hearing documents.

MS. SAMUELSON: Mr. Brown, would you like me to submit the letters that we have just received from the community at this point or wait until we get to that point of the hearing?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Why don't we wait until that stage of the hearing, and then I'll add those at that time.

MS. SAMUELSON: Okay.

MR. SHEA: Yes.

9

-10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I'll make that Document Number 1.

Document Number 2 is a "Brief in Support of Finding of Suitability for Release on Parole and Setting of Term", which was submitted by the immate's counsel, Diana Samuelson. And I will also make that a part of the record in this case:

Any other documents or exhibits will be entered at the time they are presented.

The decision the panel makes at today's hearing.

really involves two things. The first is to determine suitability. If you are found to be suitable for parole, we move to step number two, which is to determine what the term will actually be in this case. In the event you're found that table, that finding is made, the reasons are specified, and suggestions are given to you as to what you might do: to increase your likelihood of receiving a parole date in the future.

You will notice it's being recorded. To obtain a copy of that transcript, there is a form that you can get from your counselor. Fill out the form. It takes about 30 days far them to type up the transcript or the document and send you that document. But you're entitled to that at no charge, if you so desire.

INMATE GROGAN: Excuse me. Does that also include cassette tapes?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: No. This is an actual typewritten certified copy of what went on at this hearing.

There is no cassette recording of this hearing.

At this time then I would like to read into the record what the commitment offense is and a brief description of that offense.

The inmate was received in the Department of Corrections on 12/29/71, on one count of murder in the first

degrees 187 P.C., which was a result of a jury finding, arising from the Angelia County Case Number A-267861,

Count Number III. The minimum eligible parole date on this offense is 12/13/77. The victim in this case was a Donald Shea. And the offense occurred on 8/23 to 8/24/1969. And as a description, a summary of the description, I'm using the description that was written into last year's parole board decision. You should have a copy of that. It's a part of the package. I will summarize that.

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The prisoner, crime partners Charles Manson, Bruce Davis, and Charles "Tex" Watson, acting in concert with another, forced Donald Jerome Shea, a cowboy ranch hani, the victim, into a car at the Spahn Ranch in Chatsworth in the latter part of August 1969. The victim was taken to a part of the Spahn's Movie Ranch, where he was dragged from the car, beaten over the head, and stabbed in the body by each crime partner. During this occasion crime partner Charles Manson told the victim he had to die. Crime partner Manson at some point in time told the prisoner to chop the victim's head off. The body was buried under a shallow grave in Spahn Ranch. The prisoner and the above-mentioned crime partners took steps to conceal the crime, including the concealment of the burial site of the victim's body, which was allegedly chopped into nine pieces, and appropriate the victim's personal property for their own use

Family that the reason they killed the victim was because he was "bad-mouthing" the Ranch, and he was calling the man (the police). The prisoner repeated to this witness that it was "really groovy" killing the victim.

. 7

In the latter part of 1977 the prisoner, apparently motivated by the fact that people believed that he had participated in a decapitation slaying in which the victim's body was mutilated, contacted authorities, and supplied information which led to the recovery of the body of the victim. The skeletal remains of the victim showed no evidence of decapitation or mutilation. The clothing found on the remains reflected multiple stab wounds, and the head of the victim showed a skull fracture consistent with a blunt instrument striking the head.

with the blunt instrument, stabbed him twice, and returned to the scene on the evening of the murder and buried the victim in a deep grave; and that all of this was done under the orders of crime partner Charles Manson. The prisoner indicated that it was on crime partner Charles.

Manson's orders that he initially described the decapitation and multilation of the body in order to create fear in other persons.

The procedure we're going to follow at the hearing

will be an opportunity for the inmate to comment on each part; there will be an opportunity for counsel and for the District Attorney's Office to comment in each of the Stages. This is not an adversary hearing, so the questions should be directed to the Chair.

At this point we'll turn then, if there are any opening statements that either counsel would like to make any kind of an umbrella statement. If not, we'll go on.

MR. SHEA: I have no statement at this time.

MS. SAMUELSON: Neither do I.

relative to the commitment offense as to that being an accurate description or add anything to it, take anything away?

MS. SAMUELSON: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1\$

19

20

ŹŦ

22

21

24

25

brief.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Go fight sheat.

MS. SAMUEISON: As I indicated in the brief, I think a more accurate description of what happened is detailed in the most recent psych report of Dr. Sanders.

And that is also included in my brief. You will find it on page 1.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: One of three of your

MS. SAMUBLEON: I'm borry. Page I of the report

of Da. Sandar, taken right from it.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

15

19

20

21

22

23

×

25

COTTECTION YOU WANT to make?

MS. SAMUELSON: Well, initially the record should indicate that Mr. Grogan resided on the ranch before Manson and anybody else appeared at the ranch. He had gone there when you were 15, approximately?

INMATE GROGAN: Fifteen and a half.

MS. SAMUELSON: And at that time you met Mr. Shea, the victim, and had a relationship with him on and off during the several years that he was there and that Mr. Shea was there. And then when Mr. Manson arrived, it was at that time that Steve formed a kind of relationship with Mr. Manson that came into what's happening, why he's in prison today.

The psychiatrist -- psychologist, Dr. Sanders, has had conversations with Mr. Grogan about what happened. And his report here pretty much clarifies what actually did happen. And I would like to read from it so the second is fully --

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: It probably would carry more weight if the inmate himself corrected it, rather than we have the psychiatrist's expressing what the inmate told him.

MS SAMURISON ORAY SUFE

K787

7

9

10

71

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

. 25

the Comparison Release Beard decision. Okay. I noticed the second sentence says that we forced Donald Shea into the car.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

INMATE GROGAN: From what I saw of it, he was told that we were going down to the valley to buy some car parks. And he was going at the same time, and we asked if we could lide with him. That's how we gained entry to the car.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: You asked if you could ride with him?

INMATE GROGAN: Right. He was driving. So I don't think force is an appropriate context, that he invited us as a -- we could ride as passengers.

M5. SAMUELSON: I'd like to also add to that and ask Steve a few questions so that everything gets brought out that he and I have discussed.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: All right.

MS. SAMUELSON: Could you tell the Board, Steve, what fime of the day it was.

INMATE GROGAN: It was early morning.

MS. SAMUELSON: And what was the first thing that you learned with reference to what you would be doing that day? Can you like explain to the Board what you did from the

time you got up?

5

· 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

Ì₽

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

I woke up -- well, I was sleeping on -- there is a boardwalk that faces the highway. And there is a series of -- there is a bunkhouse, and there is a saloon and a kitchen. And highway. And there is a parking lot right in front of it. Well, I slept in the bunkhouse. And upon waking, that's where I came out onto the boardwalk. And I met Mr. Maison. And a couple other people -- I think it was watson -- were standing there. And Shorty was standing by his car, and they were ready to go someplace. Mr. Manson asked me to go find a pipe wrench or something heavy, which I did. And I came back, and he told me to get into the car.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: That s Shea's car.

INMATE GROGAN: Right. Get into the back seat

f, the car, and upon giving me a signal, to hit him on the

read and try to knock him out.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Hit Shea on the head?.

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

INMATE GROGAN: And so we got into the car and drove down the highway towards the valley. Spahn Ranch is about maybe 200 feet elevation above the valley floor. It's up in a range of mountains. So as we were traveling down the Santa Susana Pass -- I guess we only drove for about

right off — the road comes down, and it straightens out. And was the comes back, and it straightens out. And was the comes back, and it straightens out. And was the comes because we had some parts that we had stashed them. And at that point he pulled over; and Tex, that we with us, got outside the car and was acting like he was looking for some parts. The motor was still running; the car is in gear. I guess Tex told him that he was going to stop and just get these paramomentarily and get back into the cir, and they were going to down to the store and turn them in. At that point is told to get the guy.

- 2

7.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Who told you that? \
INMATE GROGAN: Well, it was told to me by inference from Tex. Tex was standing outside of the car on a little grassy knoll. He was saying (indicating), like hit him.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Like motioning to hit him?

INMATE GROGAN: Right. And I was scared. I didn't want to hit the guy. I kept turning around looking at the highway in hopes that maybe some cars would come by, and the whole thing would have to be called off. And I did that for about a minute and a half. I kept hesitating.

And then he pulled out a knife and finally just --

PRESTOING MEMBER BROWN; Who pulled out the knife?

INDIATE GROGAN: Tex.

PARTISING MEMBER BROWN. Tex.

THATE GROGAN: That's when I hit the guy in the back of the bead. And it surprised him, knocked him forward in the car.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: You hit him with a wrench; is that right?

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Was it a pipe wrench or

what?

2

3

ΤÒ

11

.12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plumber's wrench. And he hit the steering wheel, and he went out the passenger's side. And the car was still in gear, and it started moving towards the cliff. And that was -- if I can kind of illustrate it. Like here's the main road like this; it goes like this (indicating). And there's an embankment that you can pull off to park. And there was like a little drainage ditch. And the car was heading toward the drainage ditch. And so I jumped over, the front seat and tried to put the car in gear and stop and turn off the motor. And I got out of the car. When I came over, to where shorty and Tex was, he already had been stabbed and --

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: You went back to where Shorty and Tex -- Who's Shorty?

MINAS GROSAN: Shea.

MS, MANUELSON! Shorty is the victim.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: The victim and Tex.

Omy. What happened to the other people in the car?

INMATE GROGAN: There wasn't any other people in

the car.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Just the three of you?

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

INMATE GROGAN: Okay. And at that time another car did pull up, and Charles Manson and another person got out.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Prior to their arrival - at the scene, had you stabbed Mr. Shea?

INMATE GROGAN: No.

PRESIDING MEMBÉR BROWN: Tex had been stabbing him?

INMATE GROGAN: (Inmate nods head.)

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Is that right or wrong?

INMATE GROGAN! *T didn't see him actually stab

him. But when I got there, he was on the ground unconscious

and had blood on his stomach. So I inferred that he stabbed

him.

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: What was Tex doing?

INMATE GROGAN: Standing over him.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Did he have a knife?

TRMATE GROGAN: (Immate nods head.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

ts

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER SHOWN; Okay, Now then, Manson

him, handed me a brife, and told me to stab him.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Who told you that?

INMATE GROGAN: Mangon

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

INMATE GROGAN: So I stabbed him twice in the upper thest area. And then I left the scene.

We stood around, and another person stabbed him. And we drug the body to the bushes and covered it up with some leaves. And then we left. I left. I walked back through a creek that was off the side of the embankment.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: You walked --

INMATE GROGAN: Back to the ranch.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Did you see other people

leave the scene?

INMATE GROGAN: Not -- well, they were -- everybody was departing at once. That's what I remember. I was walking downhill; they were walking up over the hill onto the highway.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Towards the cars?
INNATE GROGAN: Right.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Then what happened?

Changed my clathes and took a shower.

mention that later that night you went back.

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

7

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INMATE GROGAN: To bury the body.

or did you go on your own?

INMATE GROGAM: Well, I was told to bury it.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Who told you to do that?

INMATE GROGAN: Charlie, Charles Manson.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And then did you choose the place where the body was to be buried?

INMATE GROGAN: Yes. I moved it down from where we had it, and I dug a shallow grave.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Counsel?

MS. SAMUELSON: Yes. I would like to ask a couple questions.

Steve, could you tell the Board about how long you had known Manson up to that point. Like in months, years, about how long, can you recall?

INNATE GROGAN: About -- it seems about two years; a year and a half.

MS. SAMUELSON: Okay, And with reference to

Shorty's presence on the manch, would you describe the relationship between Shorty and Manson and the rest of the people who were on the ranch in terms of any hostility or any ill feelings between them.

3

7

Ś

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

Z5

INMATE GROGAN: At what point in time?

NS. SAMUELSON: Well, culminating at the time that he was killed.

INMATE GROGAN: Well, it was like a growing hostility. They didn't like him. Charlie didn't like him because he was -- he was always drinking, and he thought he He was, you know -- was always talking about messing with the girls that were there. And it was like, you know -- it was kind of subtle at first, the way, you know, he voiced his dislike and disapproval of the man. Like he would bring it up in conversation at dinner when we all sat around and ate. Over a period it grew worse until and then we were raided by the police where everything we had was taken, that we had bought legitimately. All our tools. and cars and all the possessions that we had accumulated. And plus the children were taken, too. Everybody was arrested on the ranch. In fact the only person left was George Spahn, and he was blind. And they had Carl's brother come in and watch him so he would have someone to take care of him.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Why were you arrested?

INMANTE GROGAN: I was under the -- because Mr. Shea had told the police that we had a stolen car ring. Okay? Well, we spent three days in jail, and we were released. And we didn't get back none of our property. The pink slips were confiscated -- along with our property -- to four or five dune buggies that we couldn't get back from them; the children put into foster homes. And what it really did is made everybody really upset at this guy, because I was led to believe that he was doing it to get us evicted off the ranch, to get us thrown off the ranch. And that was the only place we had to stay at the time. And it was through his actions that he caused us this trouble. I think it's -you know -- excuse me It goes -- you know, it goes -- it's kind of hard for me to talk about this because there are a lot of emotions that I have experienced, guilt and stuff, you know, what I did. But there was, you know, a feeling almost of hatred toward the guy because of what he made us go through, the children and stuff. Bike we had held the children in really almost the highest position. home delivered and breast fed. It was like - our feeling for the children was really the highest thing we felt. This was mostly the whole reason we was all together; to put the children in a good environment, free from social . indoctrinations and stuff, try to raise them as natural as we could. And then to have someone come along and form a

14

17.

19

20

2]

22

23

24

25

false sport and have them put in foster homes, it was really a blow to the woman and men that were at the place at the time.

out, Steve, is what kind of things were going on between you and Manson and the other people on the ranch in terms of drugs, in terms of times when everybody would get together and talk and have kind of -- you explained this -- some kind of sessions. And I'd just like you to give the Board an idea about what kind of things were going on and how they affected you.

5.

.

. INMATE GROGAN: Well, I don't know if the Board has that much time. It's pretty involved.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Just a brief description, if you want.

INMATE GROGAN: If I can. It's pretty involved.

I'm going to have to ---

PRESIDING MEABER BROWN: Try to get at it as it relates to the crime that has been committed.

INMATE GROGAN: Right. Okay. Well, it's like everything -- the people that -- when I first met him, it was like if you wanted to be with the people, you had to give away everything you had. And after doing that, it was like a period of testing to see whether -- you know, if you really wanted to be with the group, as far as your helping

the group out, do things, bringing money in, bringing food and clothing and helping them do the work. And we used to have sessions, and everything was done together. Like we would eat together: no she would eat until everybody was there. There was no possessions; nobody had any possessions. It was all towards everybody in the group. And like at certain times we'd all -- we'd take acid, sit in one room for like maybe 15 hours, sit in one chair while Charlie would just espouse the different doctrines. And I don't know, as I look back on it, it was more of a mind manipulation. He'd set up a scene, you know, where these people who were more closer to him would -- set up a situation where it opened a person's head up, and he would be vulnerable to any kind of a suggestion or programming or any type of philosophy that he wanted to espouse at the time. It's like it was an intentional -- like the main thrust of the philosophy was that we had to get rid of our egos, because if our egos were involved in anything we do, it would bring in confusion. Therefore we had to give up our ego and will to things on our own as far as running things at the ranch. We were orientated into the position of just doing what you're told; let someone else, you know, take the lead. And it's, through these sessions that I think that broke down any conscious defenses I had against any hypnotism or post-hypnotic suggestions. Because at the time

3

10

^11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

experience we far as any street living, as far as decomposed toping to hustle me into any kind of asstitution. I really thought sincerely that what he was doing was good and true and right.

sessions, you indicated before to me that at some point there would be some physical violence going on, too. If people didn't obey orders, like they were enforced physically to some extent. Is that true?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

717

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah. I mean, if someone didn't do something just exactly the way he said it, he would go into a tirade, break something or slap somebody around or slug them. And a lot of times -- when I look back on it it looks like he was using the girls to talk to different. people through, people who just came to the group, like He would yell at the girls and tell them, "You're me A stupid. Why don't you do it this way?" But he would be the person he would want to talk to would 📭 in close eno proximity where he would think he was talking about him. We would use the girls as a buffer so the guy can't come back and say, "Hey, what were you talking about? Were you talking to me?" But me didn't wiolent in the sense that what he wanted done, he would demonstrate, I think, by psychodramas. Are you familiar with that?

â

1 F

PRINCIPAL MENDER BROWN: YOU.

inference to the point of fear. Because he always used to play with knives. He was really good handling a knife. He'd throw it at you and stick it right there (indicating). It's like it was always a common belief amongst people that was there that, you know, if you didn't do what you was told, you would be killed or, you know, something bad would happen to you, in that sense. So I was operating under that type of coercion in the back of my head as I was doing my daily activity.

MS. SAMUELSON: Let me ask you, Steve, with reference to your feelings towards Shorty, did you somehow in your own mind hold him responsible for what had happened with the police coming in and raiding?

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah. I was convinced that because of his actions, that caused the harm to come to everything we had and the children. That was — it was like kind of everybody's feeling at the ranch towards him was like everybody was — before we talked to the person. I used to work with him before earlier, when I used to stay there earlier, when he used to come for maybe a month at a time. He'd work for a month for room and board, maybe a few bucks. Then he would leave. He was kind of like a drifter. He would come back for maybe seasonal work. And at one point

in time we did think to him and perriended him and was nice to him. While the trying to hurt us, threaten our position at the ranch, you know, we generally out him off, and no one would talk to him. And I guess the belief that he wasn't no good just kept increasing in intensity. I was thoroughly convinced that he was out to get us evicted kicked off the ranch.

MS. SAMUELSON: Okay:

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: What happened to the wrench after you hit Mr. Shea with it?

INMATE GROGAN: To the wrench? I left it in the car.

MS. SAMUELSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you said "the ranch."

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And what happened -- or where did you get the knife that you used to stab the victim?

INMATE GROGAN: It was handed to me.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Who gave it to you?

INMATE GROGAN: Charlie Manson.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And what did you do with it after you stabbed the man twice?

INMATE GROGAN: I just left it there.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Was it left in the body

or -

- 10

ij

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

23

24,

25

INMATE GROGAN: No. I stabbed him, and I -- I

either handed it back to the person that gave it to me or just look it and emeone else picked it up.

APRESIDING NEMBER BROWN: Mr. Shea, do you have any questions about the commitment offense?

MR. SHEA: No. not at this time.

6

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

19

20

- 21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Panel have any questions?

BGARD MEMBER COLLIER: Just one question. In the Appellate Court decision on page 2 there is mentioned —

"
I'll read it in part.

powered Shea, knocked him out, removed him to a remote area, tied him to a tree, whereupon several members of the troup, appellant included, stabbed the then conscious Shea many times with a machete."

Was he ever tied to a tree?

INMATE GROGAN: No. That was the story that we were told to tell other people to create an atmosphere of fear surrounding the killing.

MS. SAMUELSON: I just wanted to add that it's important to note, in considering all the statements that appear in the various documents, that in the Appellate opinion itself -- or not in the Appellate opinion. I'm sorry. In the sentencing transcript there is mention that the prosecution witness -- and I can direct you to the page --

one of the key prosecution witnesses was on LSD or and off, and that their credibility was somewhat hampered by that fact.

Ħ

₹.14

is --

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Is that the witness who was supposed to have been in the room sleeping?

MS. SAMUELSON: No, I think that was another one.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Here is "Paul Watkins,

the key prosecution witness, was a user of LSD."

MS. SAMUELSON: That's the one.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Now, was he the one who was supposed to make the statement that he was tied to a tree?

MS. SAMUEISON: Well, I don't know. I think that what has happened throughout this case — and I don't know whether Mr. Shea can shed some light on it — but there were several statements made by several different people.

There were lots of things going on at the time. This case

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: That's why I asked Mr. Grogan to clarify it for ms.

My other question is that as you sit here now. discussing what was going on at the ranch, I get the feeling that perhaps you were not that content or, you know, that particular about being there. Is that correct? There were times that you really had the feeling that you ought not be there. Did you ever feel that way?

STORE ON BULL Fard, and I felt like leaving.

ECARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. That's the point
I'm getting to. If in fact you did ever feel like leaving,
why did you not leave?

INMATE GROGAN: I felt -- because every time I left the ranch, somehow I felt guilty for -- like I was abandoning the group, kind of like a guilty feeling. I was never away from the ranch more than a day, two days at a time, because they -- it was programmed like they needed me to be there to help.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. So you lived on the ranch from the time you were 15 until you were arrested on the commitment offense; is that correct?

INMATE GROGAN: Well, the ranch burned down, and was living in -- I was living different places. Sometimes I lived at the ranch out of a mobile home. I was bouncing around at that time after the ranch burned down.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. Was there any contact with any members of your family during this period of time?

INMATE GROGAN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: There was, but you chose not to go back and live with them?

INMATE GROGAN: I stayed with them for a few days when the fire happened. There was a big fire like in '70.

County. And I stayed there for about a week with my parents.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Mr. Vineyard.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Well, I think I can understand the description that you have given here of the situation that prevailed at the ranch at that time when you speak about the atmosphere of fear and Manson as the power force and the evil influence and use of psychedelics as an indoctrination and control tool, these kinds of things. He was a very dominant individual, at least as far as the individuals whom he wanted to dominant were concerned. But Befer hurders, before the group was broken up as a result of the investigation that followed the killings, wasn't there guite a bit of change within that group? Weren't there people coming and going?

- INMATE GROGAN: There wasn't -- like it wasn't an overwhelming turnover. But there was -- some people would leave and come, go and come. People would leave, and then they'd come back. They'd come back feeling guilty that

JODINE.COM ARCHIVES

they had left. It was really strange, man, because like the way he played it off is that you couldn't stay away for very long ampways. It was meant for you to be in this group, a universal soul, you know, brought us all together to -- man, just his philosophies. I think he had a philosophy every time you turned around. But at the time -- before I met him, I'd like to say where my head was at, if it's all right. I used to read metaphysical books, and my head was open to that type of conversation and philosophizing.

· 7

25.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Okay. Let me follow through with what I started here. Some of the people who came into that group and gravitated out of it were either rejected by Manson because they didn't fit into the group; i.e., they weren't subject to this kind of domination by him or they were repelled by the entire situation. But you stayed. You stayed. You permitted this influence to be exerted over you with the result that we know. My concern would be that if you are this kind of person, what kind of assurance is there that could ever be given that you might not again find yourself in a situation where, in answer to a question from someone like Mr. Brown, "Why did you stab him?" you will say, "because Charles," told me to do it." That was the reason you gave for stabbing this man. Now, the combination is hever going to fall into

place was derived it was before. But obviously at that point a standpoint you are a very, very, easily led, suggestible, dependent kind of person. Now, if that situation still prevails as far as your general personality makeup is concerned. I can see this happening again, maybe not this way, but maybe some other way that would bring you back for a similar offense. What would be your answer to that?

. 8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

21

22

23

24

25

FINATE GROGAN: First, it was 10 years ago. a completely different person to this point. I was young, 16 years old, you know. I was vulnerable to any hustler that would want to hustle me, really, because of my lack of street experience, my lack of just being out in the world, period. I probably would have gone for anything hook, line, and sinker, any salesman or hustler that wanted to hustle me, because they caught me at that age, that point of vulnerability. I was manipulated very easily. My defenses for what he had for me were, you know, almost nonexistent. It was two years after I was already incarcerated that I realized the games that he had run on me, psychological games. It was over my head, out of my awareness. just, you know -- and now that I have been around hustlers. and all types of people in the criminal line of existence, there is no way I could let anybody hustle me into anything, into believing a certain philosophy.

to the most recent report, staff is still describing you in terms of your passivity and your dependency. Whether or not this is still at that same degree it was 10 years ago can be debated, and probably isn't, as you say. But whether or not it has reached a place — what could you offer as a demonstration of the fact that you have become your own man in the past 10 years that this kind of incluence couldn't be exerted over you again?

1f

. 19

that if I'm so dependent as they suggested, I would most likely be in one of these gangs or cliques and my dependency would be on the group itself. But over these years I haven't joined any cliques or have any desire to join any cliques.

MS. SAMUELSON: There is a letter in fact in the file to indicate that there was a reference that he was a member of one of the white groups, and that was corrected to show that there is no such affiliation. That's also in the file. I'm sorry; I just wanted to bring that up.

INMATE GROGAN: The fact that -- I think my record states that I'm more or less a loner. It's like I down't hang around with a lot of groups of people. I have managed to complete a trade by myself with no help from nobody. I managed to come to the point from a fair guitar

player to take off the state competition in the music field.

And that was -- nobody helped me do that. That was all my own effort. I managed to put together a nice portfolio of artwork. I managed to become fairly versatile with art at this point.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Okay. We're going to try to go over all those things. You have provided what to me is a good answer to the question.

presiding MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Let's turn then to a brief review of your prior criminal history. And to do that we'll look in two places. One is the CTI criminal history sheet, and the other is in the Probation Report. There are two Probation Reports in the packet. One of them is for the murder offense; the second Probation Officer's Report pertains to the conspiracy offense. And I just want to hit page 3 of that report which contains a listing of the prior record to make sure that we have it right.

And they show the first entry of 6/5/67, arrested under 602 Welfare and Institutions Code for the possession' of marijuana, at which time you were counseled and released. That's the first entry we have all that correct?

INMATE GROGAN: Um-horn.

12:

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And what was that for, smoking pot?

INNATE GROGAN: No. I was in a car riding.

passenger. And I was pulled over, I think for a regular check. And the police found one stick of marijuana upder the seat. There was three people in the car, so they took us all three in. And they called my father and just counseled me

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. The next entry is 8/12/67, L.A.P.D., shoplifting. You forfeited bail in that case. What was it that you took?

INMATE GROGAN: L.A.P.D.?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Um-humm. Shoplifting. On September 29th of 1967, you forfeited bail. The rap sheet indicates bail was \$550.

INMATE GROGAN: The only shoplifting that I remember I was arrested for when I was a juvenile, I a pair of socks from a department store. And as I remember, I was taken straight off to juve hall. There was no bail posted.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: The next entry, 4/5/69, Los Angeles County, grand theft money and prowling. It shows that you were released. There was insufficient evidence to prosecute.

On 5/20/69 in Los Angeles, grand theft auto.

And the District Attorney in that case rejected that complaint.

Then on 6/11/69, the Sheriff's Office in Ventura,

you were arrested for a child molesting, indecent exposure charge and referred to Ventura County Probation Department.

And I gather on that, that eventually was dismissed.

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

ÌΟ

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Zł

- 22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: It says you were wearing rat eaten trousers with holes in them and playing with kids. And one of their mothers reported that.

Then on 8/16/69 there is a grand theft auto arrest, and there is no disposition shown. But it appears later on that once the homicide -- you were arrested on the homicide, they dismissed some charges. Was that one of the charges that was dismissed at that time or not?

MS. SAMUELSON: I don't think so. I think was there is another grand theft auto here that relates to a truck that was borrowed or rented out and wasn't returned on the due date.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: That was out in the valley someplace.

INMATE GROGAN: I rented a truck from the valley,

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Hold it just a second. Let's stay with this 8/16/69. You don't recall that one, August of '69? Because this other one you just mentioned is a little bit later in that year.

PNMATE GROGAN: I remember I was arrested for

driving -- I was -- they had -- people at the ranch had recently moved, and I was driving a motorcycle to the place that they had moved. And I had the wrong address, and I drove down to this guy's house. And the condition the bike was in, I couldn't get back up to the pavement. And he called the police, and I was arrested.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay - Then let's look at the 1 10/69. That's the contributing to the delinquency of a minor, receiving stolen property, Deadly Weapons Control Law, escaping from a state mental hospital. I gather as a result of the child incident, they sent you over to Camarillo. And you left. And they eventually dismissed that in the interest of justice, and you were released to Los Angeles County because of the homicide warrant. That's what it says.

MS. SAMUELSON: That was a year later in November. November '70 is when you were arrested on the homicide.

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

MS. SAMUELSON: And so the cases that were still pending were just terminated because they figured, I guess, it wasn't worth prosecuting on those.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Then we see one on 12/6/69. This is the grand theft auto, taking a car without the owner's permission. And on this one proceedings were suspended; probation was granted for three years with intensive supervision recommended. Now, I would gather then

that you were on probation -- this offense occurred after the murder offense?

MS. SAMUELSON: Yes.

5

6

7

to

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

weapon?

presiding MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Then it shows an 11/8/70 arrest for possession of illegal weapon in Los Angeles. There is another entry 11/10/70, which appears to be -- it's a different location, Independence?

MG. SAMUELSON: I think those are the same.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Possession of illegal

INMATE GROGAN: Right. They arrested me, and they released me. And then they rearrested me.

MS. SAMUELSON: On the one warrant maybe.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: And those are the ones, that were ultimately dismissed when the homicide occurred.

Okay.

Now then, other than one in December of 1970 then that's when you had a conviction for conspi

Received 90 days

No. No. Pas in April of '70.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Yeah, but the arrest was in December. But he pled in April.

MS. SAMUELSON: '71, year' 1.
PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: '71.

Have we covered your arrest record and conviction resord? Does that appear to be it?

INMATE GROGAN: I guess so, yeah.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Any comments from panel members on the prior record?

.Mr. Shea?

9

10

11

12

14

15

16.

18

19

20

21

22

.23

24

25

MR. SHEA: I have no comment.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Counsel.

MS. SAMUELSON: Well, I would like to have Steve explain a little bit about what each was about, if the ... Board thinks that -- you know -- particularly with the indecent exposure, because I know that that's a sensitive area. And there was no intentional exposure.

INMATE GROGAN: Do you want to go from page 3 of the arrest record from the top, or do you want to start --

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I think you have already explained the first pert. If you went to comment on the indecent exposure, go ahead. I think it's fairly well explained there.

INMATE GROGAN: In the indecent exposure, I had received a traffic ticket in the San Fernando Valley; and I was ordered to pay a fine. So I went to talk to my brother, who was living at my parents' house at the time in Simi Valley. He said he would loan me the money to pay the fine. So I went over there from the ranch. And I went

to the house, and no one was home. So I sat on the corner two houses down — one house down from my parents' house. And some neighborhood kids were playing there, and I guess they recognized me. And we were playing, rolling on the grass; and they were throwing grass at me and stuff. The pants that I was wearing was the ones that I wore to work on the ranch. And working on the ranch, I didn't wear any underclothes. And the crotch was ripped out, and evidently I exposed — when I wrestling with the kids, I exposed myself. My genitals maybe fell out the crotch. And across the street a woman noticed it and called the police, and I was arrested.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Why did you escape from Camarillo?

INMATE GROGAN: I walked off.

INMATE GROGAN: I was scared. The night before, some patient took some weights in a bag and hit an officer over the head in the same dorm that I was sleeping in.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Where did you go when you walked?

INMATE GROGAN: Went back to the ranch.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. And when were you captured again?

INMARE GROCAR: I guess in Independence, 10/10/69.

ð į

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

MS. BAMUELSON: Also with reference to this grand theft auto that you pled guilty to with reference to the truck, why don't you explain what happened with that.

purposes of hauling some supplies to the desert. I rented it for one day. And I got to the desert, and the truck got stuck. I was going over these washes, these real thick paths, and it got stuck between two rocks. And the next day there was an arrest. We was all taken up to jail. In the meantime the company had heard nothing back from us, and there was no way for me to get ahold of them. I think we were allowed one phone call from the jail, and it was to call some people to see if they could post bail. So evidently they thought I stole the truck and put out a warrant to the see them, and I paid full restitution in damages and pled

see them, and I paid full restitution in damages and pled to a misdemeanor breach of promise. That's what I think the final conviction was, a misdemeanor.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

MS. SAMUELSON: And with reference to this conspiracy, could you indicate what was that about, the witness?

INMATE GROGAN: The witness was supposed to testify against Charles Manson in the, I think, Tate or

ŧ5

и

LaBianca trial. At the time that she came to the ranch, she didn't want to testify. She expressed that, I believe, to the girls that were there. And I guess the girls were sympathetic with her. And I saw her that night, and I was talking to her. And I made love to her. And the girls wanted to take her to a friend's house. So I drove them all over -- I was driving everybody all over the place. I had a license. And I left the house, and so they said I was in a conspiracy trying to persuade a witness. From what I gather from what the girls told me, she wanted to leave the state so she wouldn't have to testify.

MS. SAMUELSON: So what prompted you to do that? Was there something -- there was something in here about a woman being pregnant.

the people I was with didn't want her to have the baby in jail because of the conditions. They'd much rather have her on the street. So we asked the District Attorney if it would be acceptable to him if we pled noto contendere and she could be released on her own recognizance to have the baby and thereupon return to court to serve time. And at that point we agreed, and we did plead to a noto contendere.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Anything else, Counsel?
MS. SAMUBLSON: No.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Let's turn to the institution adjustment. Mr. Vineyard.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You were received by the Department of Corrections back on December 29, 1971.

And after you initially were in the Reception Center, all of your time up until May 24th of this year was at DVI, was it not?

INMATE GROGAN: Correct.

. 5

6

9

10

11

12

•13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.23

24

25

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: And you were sent to CMF from DVI for purposes of a Category D evaluation, which has now been completed.

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: And this was at the request of the Board.

I think what I'd like to do is to start with the psychological report progression here, beginning back with the first in the file by Dr. Wittner, psychiatric evaluation — that's W-i-t-t-n-e-r. Psychiatric evaluation of March the 7th, 1972. Apparently there was some confusion in his mind at that time with regard to whether he could document where you were at that point psychiatrically. He gives no diagnosis, stating that

"The diagnosis is not clear. Subject may be suitering for sonic brain syndrome due to LSD use with impairment of his

reasoning power. On the other hand, he may simply be exhibiting a mixture of low intelligence intermingled with Fastern philosophies. I did not have the feeling that he was malingering."

.18

Earlier in the report he had discussed with you possibilities of perhaps involvement in treatment. And that didn't seem possible at that point because of your general attitude toward your own condition and what you saw as your needs at that times

The next report was done on October the 21st,
1974. And this was a psychiatric evaluation done by Dr.
Wittner again. This was the second time he would have seen
you. And he said in that report that

When I interviews subject preViously, I could not make up my mind
whether Subject's disordered mentation
was secondary to drug abuse or whether
it reflected genuine mental illness.
Since Subject's thinking continues to
be as disturbed as it was two years
ago, I think that this man is suffering
from chronic schizophrenia."

And that was the -- led to the diagnosis given further in the report of achizophrenia, chronic, undifferentiated type,

in partial realization. At that time he reported that from a psymbiatric standpoint you had made no gains. Violence potential within the illetitution appeared to be low; judging by the way that you had conducted yourself up to that point. But he goes on and says that

"However since Subject's mental state is disturbed, he should be considered as somewhat unpredictable. Subject may be in need of psychoactive medication, but is functioning without such drugs at this time. Since his schizophrenic process is in partial remission, I see no clear-cut indication for use of drugs at this time. Subject is not interested in receiving medications. Regarding psychotherapy, Subject expressed the view that he was all right and there was no need to ' mess with his mind. 8 However if I insisted on group psychotherapy, he would comply. I doubt whether Subject would benefit much from psychotherapy at this time insofar as he is inacces sible to reasoning and rigidly adheres to his illogical mode of thinking."

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You have these reports, don't you, Counsel?
MS. SAMUELSON: Yes.

PEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: I am selecting parts that I think are significant both from the standpoint of what his situation was at that time and how in accumulation the reports do show the type of progress that he did as we go along here.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

<u>.15</u>

46

18

19

20

22

23

MS. SAMUELSON: I guess I'll just wait to comment until after you finish.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: I'll do this whole section: then I'll give you an opportunity to speak to whatever you want with regard to psychological-psychiatric reports.

Dr. Wittner saw you again for the third time in February of 1976. And he stated then that

"Mr. Grogan's behavior has become more predictable. The schizophrenic process is in still better remission than was observed in 1974."

The diagnosis given is still chronic schizophrenia, undifferentiated type, in good remission.

"It is impossible to state if and how Mr. Grogan's, psychopathology was connected with the alleged offense. If he in fact committed the murder, it is

possible that he was already schizophrenic at that time. However any such speculations would fall into the realm of intangibles.

"Mr. Grogan has made psychiatric progress to a moderate extent; and by the time he is ready for parole, he will be able to hold his gains. He may require psychoactive medications in the future:

"If his mental condition does not deteriorate, aggressive potential should not be more than slightly above average for parole. Aggressive potential within the institution at this time is average only."

10

12

13

14

15

Ì6

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

Then you were seen again by a Dr. John A. Malloy.
That's also at DVI. And his evaluation -- the next one is
dated October the 6th, 1977. Dr. Malloy's report said,

"I could not elicit any special symptoms of schizophrenia or pathological thought content. There were no signs of an acute or chronic depression, overt paranoid ideation, or organic brain damage.

"It was my impression that he should the distinct signs of a thought

His emotional responses were at times appropriate to the topics discussed.

At other times, however, they were quite inappropriate, particularly when he talked very briefly about his instant offense.

.11

·12

"This inmate's emotional condition now is essentially the same as that described in the psychiatric evaluation of February 1976. He still shows, in my opinion; quite definite signs of schizophrenia as manifest in his thinking and emotional reactions. At no time, as nearly as I could determine, has he ever had hallucinations or delusions.

"He absolutely does not see himself as having any emotional problems or conflicts. He does not have any unpleasant emotional symptoms. He is not interested in any type of treatment program.

"It is my impression that this inmate has a chronic mental disorder, but it is really impossible to know what part, if any, this played in his

instant offense. He feels completely well and his smotional condition essentially stable. There is no indication for medication; and, in fact, he stated that under no circumstances would be interested in taking medication.

The major concern in my opinion is the fact that when he is eventually released on parole, he may decompensate from an emotional standpoint, with increasing thought disorganization and impaired judgment. Under these circumstances, and again given the history of his violent instant offense, he could become, I believe, extremely dangerous. Most certainly whenever he is released, he would have to be very closely followed in a mental health program, such as a Parole Outpatient Clinic or an outpatient facility under a county mental health service.

has been extremely violent. And I would see his violence potential continuing

nite period. Within an institutional
nite period. Within an institutional
fairly well. And assuming he remains
stable from an emotional standpoint.
I would see his violence potential as
being average. Should there be any
evidence at any time that he is getting
increasingly emotionally disturbed, as
manifest by behavioral problems or
symptoms of nervousness or depression."
he should be promptly referred to the staff psychiatrist.

ťΟ

. 19

The next report is a psychological evaluation dated December the 5th, 1977. And this is done by Psychologist Edmund Mackenberg, Ph.D., Senior Psychologist at DVI. And there seems to be some — at this point there seems to arise some dispute between the diagnoses as given previously by Dr. Wittner and as Dr. Mackenberg saw you at this point and was able to reconstruct the way that you presented yourself during earlier evaluations. He said that

"Mr. Grogan has been noted as a chronic, undifferentiated schizophrenic in his last three psychiatric interview reports. In the two-and-a-half-hour interview today no

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sconders signs of schizophrenia, such as haddicinations or delusions, could be *Mr. Grogan's affect would appear to be appropriate, also his mood tends to be a rather monotonous and . depressed one, as noticed by Dr. Wittner two years ago. This man would appear to be quite capable of understanding reality, although he tends to talk in idealistic terms about what should be rather than what is. There would not appear to be any deviancy from reality. to such a degree that I consider that he was in any way schizophrenic today. This man would appear to be quite capable of relating to others in a loving fashion and would appear quite capable of interacting with others in a realistic and sensible fashion.

"His thinking is somewhat tangential ... answers are not always
readily understood, although he can
make himself readily understood by

"Plication Libere is a rather
school due ley to this man in the

interview, but there would certainly not

pear to be any indications today of a

chronic, undifferentiated schizophrenia."

And he gives the diagnosis of schizoid personality
associated with dyssocial behavior.

/5

Grogan is an imminent menace to anyone at this point in his life. His ability to function on parole would appear to be quite within the bounds of a good probability. His likelihood of regressing into a schizophrenic condition would not appear to be high at this point. His violence potential within the institutions would appear to be duite low and is not seen as more than low to moderate in the community."

He recommends follow-up by Parole Outpatient Clinic and states that

"His likelihood of becoming a vicious and imminently dangerous person even in distress would appear to not be beyond the bounds of a reasonable possibility at this point in time, however. His course on pardiage when paroled, should certainly

include an anti-drug testing and an anti-alcohol provision. A course of the course of the course would certainly be in his best interest at some point in his career" -- and he's talking there about your institutional career -- "particularly now that he is able to face up to the fact of his crime, and it would appear his

I believe one of the things that happened, Steve, was that at about the point somewhere between the last evaluation done by Dr. Malloy and the time that Dr. Mackenberg saw you, that you admitted guilt in the offense. Is that correct?

amenability to therapy is increasing."

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: The final report before the Category D evaluation is dated Adgust 1st, '78.

This is a psychological evaluation done by Melvin Macomber, Ph.D., Senior Psychologist at DVI. And he states;

"Current psychological testing shows no serious psychopathology. Grogan is seen as somewhat of a nonconformist who is quite haive and unsophisticated. He is not criminally oriented. He has a strong passive and intellectual orientation

. .:

. - 3

4

•

ź

۰

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

41

23

24

25

his feelings. He has a strong interest in the artistic and literacy. Grogan's defenses against future drug usage are quite good, and it is not believed that he would revert to drug usage upon parole."

The diagnosis given is schizoid personality, improved.

He finishes by writing that

25.

"At the time of the commitment offense, Grogan was heavily influenced by drugs and the Manson Family. For the last several years he has been quite confused, guilt ridden, and fearful. He has shown considerable improvement at this time, and there is no evidence of psychopathology which would indicate a potential for violence in the future. Grogan is not in need of psychotherapy. Violence potential appears to be below average. Prognosis for successful adjustment, in the community appears to be very good."

That was \$1.02. You went to the Board on 8/22/78. You were trund negultable for parole at that point, and the Board recommended that you be sent to CMF, where you are at the present time, for Category D evaluation. And the Category D evaluation result of August the 13th, 1979, which was done by Bruce Sanders, Clinical Psychologist, Ph.D., and also reviewed by the Psychiatric Council. The diagnosis given is immature personality, other personality disorders of specified types.

And he writes that you were unwilling to discuss aspects of your crimes that involved other members of the Manson group.

"His initial claim was that as a matter of honor he didn't want to provide evidence against other individuals. But further discussion revealed that his major reason is his fear of retribution from Manson sympathizers."

Is that an accurate statement by Dr. Sanders?

INMATE GROGAN: I guess that summed it up pret good. I think he confused the point it was a matter of honor. I just had a feeling where I didn't want to -- wanted to give the other people a chance to tell their story.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Does foar

these people inter into part of your reluctance to discuss

IMMATE GROGAN: Yeah.

schizoid.

.9

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Yes?

INMATE GROGAN: Quite a lot, yes.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: "According to Subject's file, he was in the past seen as schizophrenic and more recently as schizoid. This evaluation provides no clear evidence of schizophrenia, and his generally quiet demeanor didn't seem severe enough to be classified as

"He is not verbally articulate" —

I think you do pretty good —

INMATE GROGAN: Thank you.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: — "and he is dependent on others. This dependency is of concern because of the evidence that the commission of the murder was related to Subject becoming dependent upon a warped sense of values.

Subject says that he has learned to think for himself and to avoid domineering leaders. I believe he

has made progress in this area. But the impression is still of a suggest-wale man who is more a follower than a leader.

"Subject has participated in individual therapy sessions with Dr.
Mackenberg and then with Dr. Macomber.
And he says he learned from these
sessions to express himself better."

How long were you involved with Dr. Mackenberg in -- this was one-to-one therapy?

INMATE GROGAN: Right, one-on-one.

Ю

Z3

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: How long were you in that?

off and on. I'd go -- off and on I'd go and see him when he had time. We'd talk mostly about conditions of the mind and -- well, you know, we would cover a lot of facets of psychology and the effects that cult leaders have had on people's minds, just different ways of manipulating people who are unexpecting.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Well, I know Dr. Mackenberg. And he has always had kind of an open door policy. And I would suspect that your contacts with him were on that basis, kind of as needed, without any formal

record being made of it in the file other than this report.

at the right time, he'll talk to you for three days if you let him,

How about Dr. Macomber? Were you in formal group with him or formal sessions with him?

INMATE GROGAN: It. was one-on-one.

5

7

ŧΟ

11

12

13

14

i5`

6

7

9

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: One-on-one Formal sessions with him on a regular basis?

INMATE GROGAN: No, it was no really regular basis.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Just occasionally you saw him or on occasion you saw one or the other of these doctors when something was on your mind or you had an opportunity to discuss different things with them.

INMATE GROGAN: Correct. Well, my first contact with Macomber was, I think, -- it was an annual psych evaluation, you know, that you had before you go to the Board. And from that point on, it was easy to relate to him and talk to him, you know, about different things, you know, everyday life, religion.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: The reason I'm asking you about this. Steve, is that there is no record other than in here of you having had these kinds of

contacts. They weren't on a formalized, regular, goal oriented kind of a basis; they were just sort of a drop-in situation or whenever you felt you had something to talk about, why, Mackenberg would kind of give you an open invitation.

ş

INMATE GROGAN: Year that's correct. There was no -- I don't think there was any psych program at DVI. It's more or less they'd just work up a psych evaluation for Board reports.

show moderate self-understanding, a generally coopative attitude, moderate motivation for personality change, adequate emotional stability, and generally adequate identification with society's norms.

"The referral to Category E was concerned with Subject's mental and emotional state. At present he doesn't appear to have any major personality pathology, although he does seem to be overly dependent."

And the diagnosis, as I stated earlier; immature opality. And then

"The diagnosed psychopathology has been related to criminal behavior

indirectly. During observation in the institution he had psychiatrically improved moderately. In a less controlled setting, such as return to the community, this inmate is considered likely to hold present gains.

"Violence potential outside a controlled setting in the past is considered to have been greater than average and at present is estimated to be increased (sic).

.TO

, 12°

He makes a recommendation for POC follow-up and also a recommendation that your referred for Category E evaluation, which I understand has been done; is that correct?

INMATE GROGAN: Correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: And you're active in a group right now with Dr. Mattocks?

INMATE GROGAN: We're having sessions one-on-one every week.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: One-on-one?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: That's unusual

INMATE GROCAN: I think later on I'm going to enter into a group. I think that's the whole purpose of it,

Z

P

kind of thing.

comments at either of the panel members would like to make comming the psychiatric reports?

RESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Just an observation.

You may not to respond to this. Looking backwards at the event the led up to the crime, the crime itself, and what occurred to the time of the trial, and your subsequent denial of my involvement, and then your admission and discovered to the body; at the time prior to the crime being conditted that you're relating that you felt under the influence of someone else and you did what someone else told your Eventually you're caught; you're charged. In the sentering transcript - I believe it's on page 3 -- the judge make a comment about how you performed at trial, laying down on the jury room floor while the jury was being chosen, at I guess you performed some antics in the courtroom at he didn't feel too highly about. They don't go it o any depth.

denying an sting is wrong. As you approach your minimum eligible proble date, which is in 1977, then there is a decision made to clean up what really happened to Mr. Shea. Did that he anything to do with your decision to decide how Mr. Shealand where he was?

clean out my conscience more than the facts. But that would follow. I wanted to get right with myself. I kept telling people I didn't do it; I kept fostering the same lie.

And it was just building up, you know, accumulating over a certain amount of time. There is a lot of factors that came into play which may have even intensified that effect.

Like I have recently got married before I led the authorities to the body. And I had a child. My whole outlook, my whole lifestyle that I was getting into was forcing me to come clean with myself, just not for myself, but for my family.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: When did you get stabbed in the institution, what year, do you recall?

INMATE GROGAN: '77.

2.

7

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: In '77. Did that have anything to do with it?

INMATE GROGAN: I think that, together with the rest of the events, made me realize that my self-attitude was not -- I was -- do you want me to explain what happened briefly to you?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I understand that you got stabbed, and the NF was the one that was responsible.

INMATE GROGAN: It's kind of ironic in the sense that it closely approximated the murder that I was involved

in .It seemed like I had done nothing to nobody that I knew what I did; and, you know, I was just attacked, you know.

PRESEDING MEMBER BROWN: If you turn around and look over your shoulder now way back to 1969, where do you think you are psychologically yourself right now?

5

7

10

'IT

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INMATE GROGAM: I think I'm a hell of a lot better about a hundred percent better than I was then. In looking back, I had a child's mind. I was thinking like a child. I was being led around and influenced like a child. You know, if I had the ability of hindsight that particular day, I don't think I would have done anything I did or be able to be led into situations.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: That's all I have.

MS. SAMUELSON: Could I ask a question that kind of follows that line of questioning?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Are there any other questions from the panel?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: No.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: 'Mr. Shea, would you like to comment?'

MR. SHEA: I have nothing at this time.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: All right, Counsel, anything that you would like to comment on with regard to the psychological section?

MS. SAMUELEON: Well yes, I would like to approach

2

. 7

O۶

12

13, 14

. 15 16

17

18

t9 20

21 22

23

24 25

that in a second. But I would just like to carry on with Mr. Brown's quastioning about why did you decide to all of a sudden, six years later, admit your guilt? And in that regard, I would like to read a little bit from the transcript of last year's hearing where Lieutenant Chandler, who was at DVI and who formed a close relationship with Steve, kind of gives an idea of what his viewpoint was. And it really relates to what we're talking about. I have your permission to read that?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Why don't you go ahead.

MS. SAMUELSON: There is just some general introductory statements. Lieutenant Chandler Says that he is a Correctional Lieutenant currently assigned to the NF section as the Third Watch Commander. Mr. Foley, who represented Mr. Grogan last year as his attorney, asked how long he had been employed. And he said 19 years. And have you come to know Steve? And he said yes.

> "Could you describe in what way and for what period of time you were familing with Mr. Grogan?"

And Mr. Chandler states,

I was Third Watch Commander for 10 years. During that period of time Grogan arrived at the institution. All new arrivals are given an interview upon arrival by the Watch Commander currently basigned. During that period of time they have to determine is he suitable for main line placement; should he be placed in K. Wing pending classification; could he make it on the main line. That's how I came to be acquainted with Mr. Grogan at that period of time."

And Mr. Foley asks him how long he has known Mr. Grogan And he responds.

"Six, seven years, certainly since he's been here."

And Mr. Foley asks him,

And Mr.

"And during the course of your familiarity with Mr. Grogan, have you had an opportunity to observe his behavior within the institution?"

Chandler states.

"Grogan arrived a very threatened individual. I didn't think he was what he pretended to be, but he was machoing it up front at the time. But over the period of time I've seen a great change in him. I've related to him as he's

eloDrive.com A R C H I V E S

made various requests for unlocked participation. The Match Commander at the time had to approve all unlocks for night activities. I would have to question each one of them individually as to his intent and purpose: Why do you want to unlock? Oftentimes it was because of the Board. You people get a lot of credit for a lot of attendance at night activities. The validity of it I don't know.

"I said that 'I will add your name. Now, if you fail to appear for two consecutive sessions, Mr. Grogan, you will be out. You will not, as long as I am the Watch Commander, reappear on any of my unlocks. ' He indicated he was sincere and, as the record did prove, that he was. He did have some ability and capabilities which he exercised. This relationship continued, and this is how I came to notice him more and more. as of yet read his Central File, so, I wa not aware of exactly what he was

25

TO

11

12

here for; but I certainly heard the publicity, as most Watch Commanders do. So I don't know how the other inmates would adjust to him. I discussed that facet of the situation with him. 'I don't know if you're going to make it with the groups.' He thought he could. His record proves that he did.

7

10

11

12

L3

13

16

18

19

20

Zt.

22

24

25

"Then he wanted to go into the hobby craft, which I also had at that time as a might operation. So I let him do that. He became gradually more mature-in his actions, intent, and purpose. And I related to him on an ongoing basis. Within the past year or so, two or three years, he wanted to get married. I interceded on that behalf and attended his wedding; set up various programs for him, such as encouraging his hobby craft participation and his band. I started his band for them, got an A-Quarter, and we bet up the facilities for them to practice, more as a test, I guess, for them to have something to do other than

STATE SHOUGHAND REPOSITING CORRECTION

eloDrive.com A R C H I V E S

thing succeeded rather well.

"Then he came to me one day, and he said, 'I've been thinking about My crime.' And I said, 'I don't know about your crime too much.' He said, 'I would like to talk to you about it.' Well, now, before you get involved with an inmate on a personal basis, there's some things you best consider. So I went to the Superintendent, and I said, 'I think. Grogan has had a change of heart, and he would like to talk. Now, am I clear to carry on a personal relationship with him other than on a staff development — staff basis?' And he said, 'Yes.'

9.

"Grogan came back three or four times, and he was getting closer. If you know an immate, he's laboring under two things. One is he has a pre-set thought that he's not going to communicate with you too much, and that they build into the system and they have to live with that. There are several reasons for that. He feels threatened;

10

"

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ZŻ

23

24

25

6.7

to communicate with authorities. So he finally made what we call a walk-around take. You can talk to an inmate, and he won't tell you the truth the first time out; but he'll circle it, and he gets closer and closer. I thought about the fourth time around, it was time to ask him if he was sincere. And he said yeah, he wanted to talk to me.

"He told me the nature of the crime. I asked him at that point what he would like to do about it. He said he would like to actually, physicafly assist in the location. So I go back to the Superintendent, and I get clearance again. then I got clearance to call his father and his wife and to talk to them on the conference line. This is the first time, according to his father, that he had ever admitted responsibility for the crime. So then we contacted the sheriff's office and LaPD and et cetera. They wanted to know if it was possible. So he spent all night drawing a map, and I flew down and

ieoDrive.com A R C H I V E S

Actorney. We took the map, and we spent a hectic day out digging in the sand piles. We didn't find the body. They asked, 'What would you do?' And I said, 'I'd photograph the site.'

"They really impressed me, the sheriff's office and the PD did. They called on" -- it probably should be "in" -- "a helicopter, and it appeared almost like magic; and they were photographing. We brought slides -- took movies and brought them back, showed them to Grogan out in the Super trandent's office in the company of the part of the par

So I said, 'I don't think you're go in a find it based on what he's showing. It's a wide area, and it's changed in the geven years. 'How about taking Grogan in in person?' I asked Grogan if he wanted to go. He'd go.

Well, it comes to the fact there may be an escape attempt. You really don't know the old man and Are you

Cielo Drive.com A R C H I V E S

take a chance?' I said,

"All take a chance for Grogan.' They

bee a joke going, 'If he escapes, you'll

rich cherries', et cetera et cetera.' I

said, 'That's all right. I know Grogan

well enough that I'll go.'

We did. We took him down, and we went out to the Ranch. We looked again and again. Grogan pinpointed the area that, I'd say, within 20 foot of the actual location. I was comfortable with him. They put him in jail, and I stayed at the hotel; and we brought him back. Subsequently they did find the body.

the years he's exhibited a great change.

He's matured. I think he did it ;—

discovered the body — for several

reasons. One, he probably wanted to

get it off his chest. He's gone to

church to a great extent more than he

has ever before. He's upgraded himself.

He's no threat to the institution; he's

never been a problem. In fact personally

·

7

9

1,† 12:

10

13

15

16

.17

._

20

21

22 23

24

25

the his behavior-wise.

n a maria

thing I'd like" --

PRESEDING DER BROWN: Could you be kind of

brief and cut it down?

MS. SAMBELSON: Yes. It's almost done. This really relates to the --

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

MS. SAMUELSON: "The other thing I'd like to tell you is that his reluctance; to discuss the situation could stem from several factors. One, it may involve other people. And the inmates live under a pretty heavy code that if they give up names, dates, times, and places, that involves somebody else. Eventually hels going to get out even if he doesn't say anything at all. He may not get out except on a slab if he does say the wrong thing and it gets back to the right person.

"I was a Watch Commander the time, that the Nuestra stabbed him; and I brought him off the tier. He was on a guiney, and he came by and he said,

And I said, 'The said,' The said, 'The said,' The said, 'The said,' The said, 'The said,' The said, 'The said, 'The said,' The said,

*5

Ş

"He was considerably concerned at that point that he was really going to die. I felt if he had, 'Do you have anything you want to tell me in case you do, in case I made a mistake in your diagnosis?' And he said, 'No.'"

And that ends his testimony. But I think that pertains to other aspects of why, you know, six years later he comes and decides that he's got to tell what happened and admit what happened to himself and to other people and to kind of clear up a lot of misunderstanding.

So I would just like to ask Steve if those were feelings that you felt and not just what Lieutenant Chandler may have thought you felt?

INMATE GROGAN: I think it's pretty accurate.

You live under a pretty heavy pressure to not -- you know,
a snitch don't amount to anything. A man here is under a
real pressure. You know, it's like two worlds. You're
not supposed to cross the boundaries. And this took -- it
takes time to get ever that. It took time for me to get to

23

24.

25.

with such as a location of the body, I asked if they would keep my name out of the papers because the case I know received a little bit of publicity, and for the fact that if they did mention my name, my father would hear about it. And he is living in close proximity, and it would definitely affect his relationship with his neighbors and things. So I asked them, "If you agree to that, you know, I'll show you where the body is, if you don't mention my name." And I haven't talked about it with very many inmates at all.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: The disciplinary record is the next section that we --

MS. SAMUELSON: Excuse me. Could I just make a few comments on the psych reports? Because if we're going to move from there, I did have a few comments.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Go ahead.

want to note that from the beginning, from 1972, there seems to be an imbility on the part of the psychologists and the psychiatrists to determine what's going on with this person. And I would like to fefer you to that article that I have attached to my brief that deals with people who have been involved in cults and the kind of attitude they express

upon lesving that signation. She -- Margaret Singer is the doctor that weste this article -- indicates that ex-cult members have had very special things happen to them in the cult and that in order to talk to a counselor, they have to educate the counselor. The professional often reacts to the recounting of the cult events as if the person telling the story was or is mentally ill or is fabricating the story. So that there appears that there is a definite attitude of a person when they are coming out of this situation that may not be picked up by just a person, a general psychologist or psychiatrist that really hasn't been thinking in terms of brainwashing or indoctrination to that extent. So I think that that's relevant in reviewing these reports from the beginning and noting that throughout the reports it's interesting to see the parallels between the article and the statements that are made in the reports. It seems very explanatory. She again mentions that there is a tendency to oversimplify, to state cosmic truths . and cliches, that these people who come out of that cult situation are programmed to make certain statements.

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And you'll see by reading these psych reports that he does convey that kind of an attitude. He talks about various philosophies. He is kind of unrealistic, idealistic. They just don't know what to think of him. I think that, again, the Manson indoctrination has a great

deal to downth how these reports look, and that over a period of time he is gradually coming out of that and being able to work through it. He is coming to the person you see today, somebody that can articulate, you can communicate with, and you can relate to, not somebody who is just speaking phrases that don't make sense.

٧.

ťΟ

between Dr. Malloy's report and Dr. Mackenberg's report, because there does seem to be a real difference. I would point out to you, that the reports seem to indicate a progressively better attitude from Steve. He's kind of coming out of it. Dr. Malloy's report just kind of jumps in the middle of that and says, you know, that this isn't happening. It kind of says everything opposite, which is a real surprise. I think that in evaluating that report, you should take note of what the progress has been in these reports and how it is continuing after — two months later another psychologist interviews Steve and files a report that kindiof follows up from where the other ones left off.

I have been informed that Dr. Malloy no longer workers at the institution, so I don't know whether or not that had anything to do with the institution's necessity to have another report within such a short petiod of time, because generally they are only filed once a year. I don't know why they thought it important to have another follow-up.

•9

. 19 . 20

 But make they felt that this really didn't make too much sense to find and maybe they thought, "Well, we had better have this checked again", because it's very harmful. The person is saying that violence potential is high, things that kind of don't follow the rest of the reports. And it's really evident, because when Dr. Mackenberg does file his report, he is very clear about what he feels. "He doesn't appear to be an imminent menace." He thinks there is nothing beyond a reasonable possibility that he is going to be dangerous. So he continues that line.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: The difference, for whatever it's worth, Malloy is a psychiatrist and the other two are psychologists.

MS. SAMUELSON: I don't know, whatever that's worth.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: One is an M.D.

MS: SAMUEISON: Yeah, true. But you're viewing psychologists and psychiatrists reports generally in the institution. Both professionals do file these reports, and they're kind of -- you know, I don't know what kind of weight you put on it, if you put any weight on it. I guess the individual person is important, like if you know the doctor imvolved. Like Mr. Wineyard may have an idea about Dr. Mackenberg, I dan't know. But those are my comments with relationship to these two reports.

3 e k k S

.11

· 22

Also, then I'd like to comment on the last report, the '79 memory, because it does seem on its face rather equivocal; and because I looked at it, and I didn't really know what he was saying. So I went to talk to him, Dr. Sanders, and I said, "Can you tell me what you mean when you say 'dependency'?" Like this paragraph, really I don't know what it is. He says,

"He is not verbally articulate, and he is dependent of others."

And I said, "Well, can you explain that to me a little bit?"

And he indicated that it was his impression from Steve's communication and group sessions that he would say something in response to what somebody else had said. So he would follow, he would agree or kind of just follow into what everybody else was saying, rather than initiate his own comments. That appeared to the doctor that he was dependent upon the group to communicate. So I think that has some bearing on that definition of dependency, because it fits into — it kind of makes you think that this is another — this person is saying that Steve is a Rependent; he's a follower, you know. That kind of impression I don't think is so accurate in that context. He was referring to participation in a group setting.

Also with reference to his use of the term ; "moderate", I would like to draw an analogy to that term

ODrive com A R C H I V E S

with the same translation in terms of viewing the suitability of industribility. The rules, guidelines, the law indicates that unless there is an imreasonable risk of danger or harm to society, a person should receive — should be found suitable. And he is saying moderate this and moderate that. Well, I think that you can draw from that that he saying reasonable self-understanding. Whenever he uses the word "moderate", substituting the word "reasonable" seems to make sense and seems to fit into what kind of issues we're looking at in this hearing.

7

10

11

-12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

27

22.

Z3

14

25

Also when I tarked to Dr. Sanders, I asked him about this statement, what "greater than average" and "at present estimated to be decreased", what are you saving here? What does he mean? And he said — well, he pulled out his little book. And he's got a little book, and it has form sentences in it. And he says, "This is the way it is set up, and this is what I have to write in here." And there's like — you have medium, it's the same, it's greater, or it's decreased. So "decreased" is the lowest thing he could say, and that's what he put in his report. He said "decreased."

I would take issue to the prior statement that he makes: "... in the past is considered to have been greater than average ..." I think that the reports indicate that -- Dr. Mackenberg's report in '77 indicates

that his winder presential is below average, tather than greaper thankverage. I think that maybe that Dr. Sanders was referring to was in the beginning, the beginning recommendations, the beginning observations. And I think it's clear by the time you get to '76-/77, that it's below average and not greater than average, so that the decrease is even more.

.7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

t8

19

20

21

22

. 23

24

25

appears to be overly dependent; I would also bring it to your attention that Steve hasn't been involved in any kind of a gang affiliation. There are indications that he isn't a dependent person and he isn't been a dependent person any more than anybody else in prison has to be. I mean, you have to be somewhat dependent on your surroundings in a prison situation. You can't exert independence and not get written up every second.

So those are my comments with respect to the reports.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: All right.

With regard to the disciplinary record, it has been clear at the present time for about one year and ten months. The last CDC 115 received was back on December the 4th, 1977. There have only been four of these since reception, the first being in May of 1972. And this was an action — he was found responsible for answering calls

and passes and counseled for that.

The next -- and this is the one I want to ask him about -- occurred on 6/22/75, and is described as refusing to hand over a cat. Do you recall that?

INMATE GROGAN: Yes, sir.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: I don't think the officer wrote you up because it was the cat that you wanted; I think the officer wrote you up because you refused to obey a direct order. Is that correct?

JUMATE GROGAN: Correct.

*HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Where did you get the cat?

IMMATE GROGAN: My friend on the tier below me found it out in the warehouse, and he brought it in. I haven't seen any animals in two or three years, and I was pretty excited about seeing an animal. He was reluctant to let me see it, probably knowing that I would want to take it in my house and look at it for a longer time.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: All right.
That the classified as an administrative 115 rules

infraction peort, and you were counseled for that behavior.

The is a 115 written in here relative to the attack that was made on you in June 6, 1977. It was never processed because it was determined right away that you were the viction the attacks that that

you were simbled by marrientes. Actually you might speak
to your counselor about patting this someplace else because
it doesn't belong in this section. It's not counted as a
115.

3.

6.

INMATE GROGAN: wouldn't it be classified under a 128 informative chrono?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Well, there are all kinds of informative chronos in here with regard to that, as well as a lot of incident reports. The reports shouldn't be on that form in here, in this section at least.

The next 115 was the one received on 12/14 -excuse me. Did I say -- I said, didn't I originally,
that there had been four 115's received?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I think there have been three.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: There have been three. The third and last one was the one on December 14th, 1977. And this is also marked administrative. And it was written in regard to a specific act, disregarding the rights and respect of others. An officer was opening the hospital door for the purpose of contacting an MTA. You apparently were on one side of the door. You had cotton in your nostrils, and he asked you what you needed. You stated you needed to see a doctor. He told you to wait

a pass. We still told you you dhave to wait. And you referred to him as suck face and said something about playing your games. At this time you were asked for your identification card and were admitted for treatment. This was written up because of your attitude toward the officer. Apparently you woke up with a bloody nose.

•

in my nose. Teah, I woke up with a hemorrhage

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: It says,

"When the officer would not let him in, he lost control and made the state-ment as outlined. He was found guilty by this own admission."

You were assessed three weekends confined to quarters, suspended for 90 dies to the only situation incident which I find that there was any real defiance of staff. In the cat thing, why, that was handled -- you defied them, but it was resolved peacefully.

In regard to counseling chronos - oh, there is one thing I wanted to ask you. There is a notation in here that before a visit which was held back in March of 1978 at DVI, you were locked into a security boot(h). Why was that?

INMATE GROGAN; I was? I was never locked in a-

security test (N). I think there was a chrono saying that I received a 128 saying that I had body contact with my
wife and that if I kept it up or --

18.

. 19

·/₂₂

MEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: That was quite a bit earlier. That was way back in May of '76. And this was in March of '78. There was a mistake made when it was first written with regard to the B Number. And then that was crossed out and your B Number was put down. L just wonder if there is a mistake all the way around. Anyway, there is no disciplinary action behind it. It was just interesting to me that that would be dropped in there out of nowhere that way.

There was a counseling chrono in May of 1976 in which you had been warned, and they also noted you had been warned numerous times in the past, about excessive body contact with your wife during visits. There is a disciplinary chrono written, dated April 17th, '75. This is by Sergeant Chandler, culinary sergeant, stating that you worked good for a week or two and then, in his words, became useless. He said he just recently took you back with the understanding that you wouldn't pull any more of your juvenile antics.

"Today he was asked to do some menial task, but he declined to work and submitted a request to get out. He said all he wants

wish of this I would recommend that he be granted his wish and assigned to G Wing as can pick all he wants to."

What brought that on?

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

35

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

,24

25

INMATE GROGAN: I think he wanted me to clean all of the pots out of the pot room. And I was assigned down on the line, and I told him I would just rather play my guitar all day and not work.

MS. SAMUELSON: Can I ask a question, Steve? Is that the same Chandler that --

INMATE GROGAN: No. That's his brother.

MS. SAMUELSON: His brother.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Well, it doesn't sound like you were putting out much effort at that point as far as Sergeant Chandler was concerned in culinary there. They kind of saw you as dead wood.

INMATE GROGAN: When I first arrived, I worked there about a year and a half in culinary. And I was kind of burned out on it, you know. It wasn't -- my interest wasn't in working in culinary at that time.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: gust the 16th of '73, there was a counseling session with you. You were apparently ordered to package some stacking chairs for shipment, didn't respond. He ordered you for three days in

He said yes were irresponsible and

. ts

**We feels that he doesn't need to do anything unless he feels like doing it. Further work habits of this type will result in his removal from the industries work program.

INMATE GROGAN: Can I respond to that for a second?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Yeah

INMATE GROGAN: On that particular — he was a new free man that just came in. And my job was stocking control clerk. I kept inventory of all incoming orders and requisition orders for parts for chairs and various tables, like here, and different articles industries handles And, you know, I have to be at the desk almost all the time to process the orders because they are always coming from the assembly line. Like they will order 20 chair legs and stuff, and you have to go down there and type the order and keep the books straight on what you have and go to the warehouse and get the product and bring it back. Well, at that time they had — the warehouse is comprised of maybe three or four people to do the warehouse work. And that wasn't my job assignment. My job was the stock control clerk. And I told him I had to do this work and it's not

my the baland that, that

PARING TATES VINEYARD: Have you been

INMATE GROGAN: No.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Okay. You do what you're told; then you complain afterwards.

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: The last one was a counseling chrono March 2nd, 1973, ignoring orders to move when given that order by the yard gate officer. And he said that you had done this many times before. He said your response to his counseling was -- he talked to you and told you that if you didn't start obeying what

he told you out there at the gate. you would get a 115. He said your response to the discussion was positive.

You are with Dr. Mattocks on an individual basis in psychotherapy at the present time and have been with Dr. Mattocks since sometime last month?

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: How many sessions have you had with him up to this point?

INMATE GROGAN: Roughly about five or six. I had a session today, but I was in the attorney room. I had to miss it.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You have

6

9

ĬĬ

10

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

completed for a formal training is concerned in the institution of formal self-help kind of things, you have completed a liveek course in Transcendental Meditation.

That was back at DVI. You finished that up in February of '78; is that correct?

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

BEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: We have a laudatory chrono from the rabbi at DVI which is quite complimentary of you. The Protestant chaplain submitted a more recent one -- while I'm looking for that other one -- dated October the 10th, 1979. And this is Chaplain England at DVI.

Do you go to Jewish chapel, or do you go to Protestant chapel?

INMATE GROGAN: I used to go to all of them.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You're eclectic.

INMATE GROGAN: No. I just like to talk to the guys and play for different benefits for them. They all have something to say.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Okay. Mr.

ingland says;

have a parole hearing soon. I wish to make a statement about what I felt in seeing this man. He came to DVI and to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

87

attention on March 15th, '72. I got to know him personally and was able to observe his growth and maturing pattern until he left here for Vacaville in July of '79. He has been willing on many occasions to open himself not only to relationship with this staff person, Protestant chaplain, but to subject himself to frequent critical analysis from time to time. I feel he has matured emotionally in significant ways. And whatever may have contributed to his participation in the vicious crimes of the group, he has clearly disassociated himself from violence and violent inmates. He has developed a gentleness which I and many more custodially minded than I am regard as genuine.

"I officiated at his wedding here and have noted his quiet affection for his young wife and child, watched him develop musical skills, communicative skills, and social skills. I believe this man deserves whatever trust or calculated risks those responsible for

SACRAMENTO: CALIFORNIA BSAZA

* Friding Fits immediate future may elect

fin him."

-10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That woundated, but it was submitted sometime between this date and when you left DVI, which was in July. It is shown for the October Board.

MS. SAMUEISON: There was another letter here that we just received today from a correctional officer here that I'd like to submit, too.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: A correctional officer here at CMF by the name of L. Rentfrow.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Rentfrow?

And Rentfrow does not write laudatory chronos. Did he write this one for you?

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: We'll make that Number 3.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Also the
chrono, laudatory chrono, October 2nd, '79, from the
rabbi at DVI. He said he has had regular contacts with you,
that you are active there in the Jewish congregation, that
you not only were a diligent participant in all of our
religious training experience, but a most productive
contributor to all aspects of group programs.

My humble conviction is Mr. Grogan has learned his lesson from a very difficult past. I highly recommend him for a

PEYEMS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

The society. His attitude has completely changed and made a new human being
of him, one whom, if given the chance,
would make a fine contribution to society
and human relations."

Educationally you received a GED -- you completed the GED equivalency test in 1976 while you were a DVI.

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

7

Š.

10

41

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

ĺð.

20

21

22

23

24

REARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: And also in conjunction with your vocational training in the air frame program, you received six semester hours of college credit for that.

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: And that was 2,353 hours in voc. air frame program, and you'te qualified at the present time as an aircraft welder.

IMMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You have a laudatory chrono submitted by your present work supervisor, who is the supervisor in the Central Arts Department. And you have been down there -- this is your sixth month that you have been in the program?

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Mr. Martin.

Automplishes tasks with enthusiasm.

strates a willingness to learn, accepts any and all responsibility. Since the Central Arts Department is practically self-managed by the assigned inmates, and with such a limited amount of working space, it is essential for each individual to work harmoniously with the other men. Grogan accomplishes this exceptionally well."

And you're doing silk screening for Institutional Services, as well as Central Office, lettering, sign painting, graphic art layout and paste-up.

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

ŧo

.11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: What is paste-up.

INMATE GROGAN: Well, for certificates, you paste
up a certain saying like this certifies such and such a
person or this is a pertificate of appreciation. It's just
that you put it on an opaque projector and you cut out these
paste-up stamps and you paste up words. And from that you
silk screen it, and you burn an image into a photosensitive
piece-of paper which in turn you take to another process,
and you transfer that image onto a silk screen, which islike -- the lords are inversed so there is a clear passage

for the intro flow between the letters. So it's a step

Writes this commendatory letter as the staff coordinator in the institution inmate music program. How long have you been involved in that?

INMATE GROGAN: Since the first week I drove

here.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: In July?

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Are you a

🚣 musicia,?

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INMATE GROGAN: That's correct.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: What do you

play?

INMATE GROGAN: Oh, I play several instruments. Lead guitar is my most -- that's my pet peeve right there. But I play bass: I play the flute, harmonica, clarinet, drums, piano.

MS. SAMUEISON: He made a list of them; there are so many.

HEARING PEPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You were awarded top honors is some recent type of statewide talent competition?

THEATE GROGAN: Right. Buddy Barper had staged

an inner-institutional competition between all the different

CEC -- departments of corrections, including Frontera.

Each institution had eliminations for the best band, and the best band was recorded. And the recordings were taken to San Quentin. And some disc jockeys heard the tapes and decided which was the best band. And the group that I had together at DVI took the first place and was awarded a plaque for achieving this. This is a picture of them contratulating them.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VIMEYARD: / Is Mr. Pickens / the supervisor of this?

INMATE GROGAN: He was there. In fact we played some music for him. Buddy Harper is, I think, the Director of Music in the Department of Corrections.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: I have just one question.
While you were at DVI, did you play with Beausoleil's group,
or were you involved in a different band?

INMATE GROGAN: I played in every group, except there was some amateurs that were just trying to get together.

MOARD MEMBER COLLIER: So did you play in a group with Beausoleil?

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Were you instrumental in helping to organize any of those groups that he was involved

PERSON SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

2

4

_

7

£

9

10

11

12

13

34 15

16.

炒

18

19

20

. 21 22

23

24

. 25

5

two nights a week for unlock. And this was -- built up over a period of time. Anyways, to cut things short, each band had a certain -- you had two days for unlock. I was in his group; I was in a soul group. I was in the DVI variety band, and country-western group. So, you know, I interchanged with all the different groups.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: That's all I have.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Your work record on initial assignment was average. This was while you were going through the reception assignments in cuffinary and doing quarter maintenance work, that kind of thing. And later you were assigned to industries warehouse earning average grades. And then after entry into air frame, which you were in for two years, why, of course, you didn't have an assignment during that period of time. But the work that you did primarily at DVI after you left the air frame program corresponds pretty closely with what you're doing now, doesn't it?

MOTE Professionally now.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: I see. You were hobby clerk there and orderly. And the grades are a majority of above-average grades. And Mr. Martin in your

present manignment in the Central Arts Department grades you the way. You have been in that since you arrived?

INMATE GROGAN: Right. Well, I spent 30 days working here in culinary.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: You spent another period of time in culinary. There is no question about your working ability when you want to work and when you're interested in what you're doing.

the the

10

11

12

13

14

15

-16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Busy work, dum-dum type jobs, why, you apparently become dissatisfied.

INMATE GROGAN: I get bored. It's not that I can't do it. It's just that the interest is lacking. That depends, too, I think on the motivation.

PRESIDING MEMBER PROWN: What's MPPA? MAC'I know. What's MPPA?

INMATE GROGAN: It's MPAA.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: MPAA.

INMATE GROGAN: It's a union of musicians that we have here at Vacaville.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: In the institution?

INMATE GROSAN: Right.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

INMATE GROGAN: We organize benefits. We're

playing for MC for correctional officers. They're going to have a benefit this Saturday. We're playing for that out there.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: YOU 180

the as has a life support, did you not?

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: What was involved in that as far as training was concerned, how many hours?

INMATE GROGAN: It was two night sessions, about six hours worth of study.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Cardiopulmonary resuscitation?

INMATE GROGAN: Correct, yeah.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: We see you have a hobby. Is this the hobby?

INMATE GROGAN: Yeah, trying to make it a supplemental --

MS. SAMUELSON: These are going to be entered in the art show that's coming up. They indicate a real talent, I think, and a real ability to supplement his income by his art.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Have you sold any paintings before?

IMATE GROGAN: Yes.

13,

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: What kind of income can you get out of them?

INMATE GROGAN: Well, I sold a Watercolox for

at, the persons you sell it to. But I think supplemental income, I think I could probably make a couple hundred a month doing it maybe a couple nights a week. And that's not selling a whole lot of paintings. It's just a minimum of what I have calculated as far as my income is concerned, supplemental income. I have already had an offer to buy the pen and ink over there. That's not all my work. I just picked some of it. I didn't want to belabor the point.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: What do you'
have in trust at the present time, do you know?

INMATE GROGAN: My trust account here?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Yeah.

INMATE GROGAN: About \$30. I have a bank account my parents started for me on the street which I think is currently \$500. And I've got about an acre of land they have given to me which, according to the bank president, has a loan value of \$3,000. So that could assist me possibly if I need assistance in the event that I am granted parole.

I've got to do a little PR work for the hobby

program while I'm up here. I thought maybe I would invite you people to the art show that we're having. I've got some copies here.

wife from coming to this art show. It got too expensive.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Mr. Shea,

institutional adjustment, any comment?

ŦO

. MR. SHEA: I have no comments.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Let's turn to parole plans.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Tr. Grogan, I know at this time it may be a little bit unrealistic or premature to talk about parole plans in view of the fact that you don't have a parole date yet. But I can see from letters of support that are in the file and comments made in the Board reports submitted by Gideon Jean-Jacques that you have some tentative plans. So what I'd like to do, I'd like to ask you to just tell the panel where you intend to live, who you intend to live with, the kind of employment offers that you have, and anything else that you think the Board might need to know with regard to parole plans.

TNMATE GROGAN: Okay. Well, I think, as the Board knows, there are a couple letters of recommendation, offers of work from my brother and my father. And I plan to take them up on their offers once I do get a date and get

out there. My first choice would be to work with my father at his store in Valencia as a floorman and possibly a stock control clark. And that would be about \$175 a week income.

I can find a reasonable priced property for my wife and child. And I will be living with my wife and child. I think counsel is showing you a picture of my wife and child.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Is she presently living in

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

180

٠ 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Napa?

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: And she will be moving from Napa to Valencia at the time that you get a parole; is that correct?

INMATE GROGAN: Right. She's presently going to college, expecting to be an RN, taking the courses.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: While we're on the subject of your wife, how did you meet her?

INMATE GROGAN: I met her through correspondence back in '74.

BCARD MEMBER COLLIER: So you did not know her prior to coming to the institution. How did the correspondence come about?

INMATE GROSAN: She heard about me and, I guess, was interested. Call it curiosity or whatever. And we

started writing back and forth.

10

11

.12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: She heard about you through the newspaper?

Sacramento. And I think those girls were living there at that time. So I guess their presence, her knowing about their presence maybe --

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: For the record, what girls are you talking about?

INMATE GROGAN: I think it was Sandra Good and Squeaky Fromme.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Was she friendly with them?

INMATE GROGAN: I think she lived in the same
neighborhood area. They had a garden plot, I think —

it's a common thing now — community garden where they all
participate. Each person has their row or two that they
cultivate. And I think that's where she might have seen
those people there, ran into them.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: There is some comment -- and I think I have got it here -- your wife -- and I'm taking it out of a report that was done for the last Board, last year's parole consideration hearing.

"He has married since his repetion, and the girl he chose is not a Manson follower, and was rejected and threatened

THE OFFICE TOWN DAILY SUITE 213

LACHAMICEL GROUDBULA SCAR

TERMINEL STR. 453-345

•

wife?

by the Manson girls. This forced her to move to another area and obtain a post office box so that they could no longer contact her."

Did they at some point in the her to become a part of their -- become associated with them or something? Would you explain what he means by that statement?

INMATE GROGAN: They were threatening -- the fact that I had broken their bond of -- see, originally no one was supposed to get married in their clique. And I had since cut them loose, told them not to write. And they just wouldn't take no for an answer. They would insist. As far as communicating, I have even had a counselor try to put a "return to sender" on their communications.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: So they threatened your

IMMATE GROGAN: 'Right. They threatened her, you know, that "You aim't good enough to marry this guy"; all kinds of things. It was a bad scene. I told her to move out of the area and get a P.O. Box so they wouldn't find out where she was living.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: And she has had no further contact?

INMATE GROGAN: No.

MS, SAMUELSON: There is a letter in the file

that indicates that.

ंड

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: I saw it.

parole date and these particular plans that you have developed here, they all fell through. Bo you have an alternative plan? Let's say your father no longer has a warehouse, your brother is not in house painting -- and I'm not wishing any bad will upon you -- or that the relationship between you and your wife falls apart. Bo you have any alternate plan?

INMATE GROGAN: There are many things I could do.

I could get a job as an aircraft welder at one of the various airports. There is always constant hiring at the large terminals. Plus my music, I can fall back on that. I'm a good enough musician where I can be employed as a studio musician or in a lounge somewhere. And a combination of my music ability, my art and my hobby ability -- I can make guitars. I can make high fidelity speakers. I can make fine art, jewelry boxes. Between all that, I have an income where I would be able to support myself and, you know, pay support to my wife and kid in case, like you said, there was a breakup.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. Do you send any money to your wife?

INMATE CROGAN: I send her money occasionally.

4

5

•

9

10

17

.12 13

14

15

16

17. 18

19

20

21 22°

23

24 75 Maybe when I sell a sminting, I send her 25, \$30.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Right now she's supported by Welfare?

INMATE GROGAN: Right.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: She's going to school on an educational grant?

INMATE GROGAN: Right. That's what I plan to do with this actwork is try to send her some money and send the kid some money, get her on her feet.

MS. SAMUELSON: In your little summary there of your income, it indicates that there is enough money there as soon as you get out to start to give you a cushion so that pending finding a job, you will have something to live on. The savings that his parents already have for him will give him a start.

INMATE GROGAN: Plus there is \$200 that they give to you when you leave. They might give you half of it when you get out and half of it later.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. I don't have any other questions.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I don't have any questions.

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: Okay. Mr. Shea, anything regarding parole Mana?

MA. SEEA. No.

·8

io II

₹2

: :19

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Let's turn then to closing statements and recommendations, first by the District Attorney.

MR. SHEA: Well, this immate raiticipated in a very heinous crime, the brutal killing of an individual. And the psychiatrists' reports collectively seem to indicate a very dangerous person who has improved somewhat. But their remarks are guarded as to his future. And Dr. Malloy in one of his reports on 10/6/77, states -- it's on the second page of the psychiatric evaluation for the Community Release Board, dated October 5th, 1977. It appears to be page 2 and about one, two, three, four, five, fifth paragraph down.

The jor concern, in my opinion, is the fact that when he is eventually released aparole, he may decompensate from an emotional standpoint, with increasing thought disorganization and impair judgment. Under these circumstant, and again given the history of a violent instant offense, he could have, I believe, extremely dangerous.

And you lookent the most recent psychiatric eport by Clinical Proceedist Bruce Sanders and confirmed.

 by Dr. Doddy, Staff Psychiatrist. And he is evidencing hesitations or doubts as to this individual. He says,

"Subject says that he has learned to think for himself and to avoid domincering leaders. I believe he has made progress in this area, but the impression is still of a suggestible man who is more a follower than a leader."

And then he goes on to state,

"He probably could benefit from further psychotherapy that focused on increasing his independent decision-making abilities."

But he also indicates that he is reluctant to discuss these things within group sessions. He has a reason, says he doesn't want this to get back to the Family. But, on the other hand, whatever his reasons are does impair his ability to improve his position from a psychotherapy standpoint.

For these reasons and these guarded reports, with the potential extreme of violence potential -- and keeping in mind the serious and vicious crime that he committed -- I would urge the Board at this time to find him unsuitable for parole.

But, on the other hand, if the Board were to set a matrix, I would urse the post to find it to be C II, in

2,2

źş

stabled repeatedly -- and that there appears to have been a prior relationship between the deceased and this inmate. And I would urge the Board to find the upper term of 19 years because of the vicious manner in which the crime took place and the fact that the body was buried; there was great effort to hide the body; and it was several years before he came forth and told the authorities where the body was buried.

MS. SAMUELSON: Excuse me. I think I want to just correct you, Mr. Shea, if I may, in terms of the matrix.

You said 19, upper term 19. And I thought you said II C.

MR. SHEA: C. That would be 17. Excuse me.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: C III, 17 (sic).

Okay, Counsel, closing statement.

MS. SAMUELSON: Well, I think both Mr. Grogan and I agree that the crime is serious. There is no question about that. His participation in it, though, is explained by his indoctrination, this influence that Mr. Manson had over him and other people, his particular susceptibility to it at that time of his life, his age, factors which were taken into consideration by the judge when he reduced the sentence from death to life, which was a very courageous thing to do. Considering at that time there was a lot of publicity currounding the case, it probably was a very



difficult decision for him to make, just as the decision that you are faced with is also very difficult at this time. I'm aware that the other people involved, Mr. Manson, Mr. Davis, have not received parole dates. I have read Mr. Davis! transcript of the hearing that he had; and I would distinguish his case from Mr. Grogan's case in asserting at this time Mr. Grogan should be found suitable whereas Mr. Davis perhaps has a different situation. He has two convictions, two separate murder convictions, one of Hinman and one of Shea. Manson has so many convictions that they stayed the one on Shea, so that they didn't even discuss the circumstances of that offense, except in passing. They indicated, the District Attorney's Office indicated that this murder was really the only one that had any kind of comprehensible motive to it, the other ones being just random selection killings.

. 7

+ 8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

·18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So that I think that it's time to deal with Mr. Grogan as an individual rather than as a Manson follower, a Manson, you know, gang member. All of those inferences that are rampant throughout this addendum — I'm sure you have noticed in there a newspaper article that deals specifically with Manson's transfer to another institution. Now, why that's in Mr. Grogan's file, I'll never know, except that it's in there because whoever made up the file. It'll associates him with Manson to the extent that they put

something in about Manson in his file, which I think is really unfair to him. It gives you -- it leaves you in a difficult position to assess him independently with all of this publicity that's surrounded this case.

I have also taken an opportunity to read other files in the CRB office trying to draw some similarity between this offense if you subtract the association with Manson from it. And I came across one that was very interesting. It was a situation where a man was married to a woman. He lived next door to another woman whom he fell in love with, became infatuated with: And she talked him into hiring a couple of people to kill his wife. He was* under, he said, her influence. She talked him into it, and he really was infatuated with this; so he kind of acceded to her: He hired two men to go meet him and his wife on the pretext he was taking her out for a Sunday drive. He took her out. The two men showed up, and they executed her. And he was convicted of murder for hire. Okay. was found suitable this last time. Now, those circumstances to to me seem any more bruse, any more heinous than this case. If I can just urge upon you to separate the whole Manson, you know, influence from it, the attitude, the prejudice, you have a situation where Mr. Grogan is feeling this person is threatening his lifestyle. same time, his indoctrination to this whole family is kind of

10

ΤĮ

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ZŽ

23

24

a substitute for his other family that he has kind of rejected at this point in his life. He is 15; he has taken a lot of drugs. He is experimenting in all sorts of different things: He is really susceptible at this point.

So there are two things working. There is an indoctrination process, and there also is an attitude that this person, specifically Mr. Shea, is threatening their existence. Okay. So he acts under suggestion, under direction of Mr. Manson to participate in this killing. But actually, if you look at his participation, you see where he has hit somebody over the head with a wrench, not knocking them out completely. Another person has come onto the scene, has initially stabbed him. up and influences him to the extent where he hands him the knife and tells him to stab him. At this point the person has already been stabbed. So this is no excuse for it; it is serious. But, you know, you have to divorce all of that prejudice from it and view it independently on its. own merit or dismerit, without the unfairness of Manson's name.

10

11

.12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I have a -- I'm sure that you have sat on lots of cases, and you have thused people suitable. And I'd like you to just think about those cases when you are considering

and thinking in your mind of the cases where -- they are all murders. Chay. And in that sense, they are all brutal, and they are all senseless. There is no justification for them or else they wouldn't be first degree murders. That's assumed -- and compare these things with the facts of this case.

, 1**8**

Now, I didn't sit in the CRB office for days and days, and maybe it's what's going to be needed so that I can draw some kind of statistical review to indicate that this case, when dealt with on its own, doesn't -- merits a finding of suitability rather than unsuitability, and the factors are present for the finding of suitability.

And I can review them. They are in the CRB
Rules in Section 2281(d). And practically every circumstance
in that section applies to Mr. Grogan. By the own records
of the prison and by CRB screening itself, the juvenile
record is viewed as minimal, and it really is minimal.
There is a stable social history. That's another concerp.
There are signs of remorse in this case. The motivation
for the crime, the factors indicate that it was resulting
from a significant stress in the person's life, especially
if the stress had been built over a long period of time.
That certainly applies in this case. There is a lack of
criminal hadren. Person, Mr. Grogan, was 18 at the
time. He had no prior felony convictions. His youth at the

time is another circumstance to consider.

PRESIDENG MEMBER BROWN: Can I - one point.

I come to the conclusion he was 18 at the time the murder was committed. I keep hearing 15 and 16. My arithmetic would say he is 18.

MS. SAMUELSON: That's true. He is 18 at the time.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Because during the course of the conversation, I heard 15 and 16.

MS. SAMUELSON: Well, I think that the confusion is that he was 16 when he got to the Ranch. He ran away from home at 15, got to the Ranch. And Manson shows up a year later, and he is 16. And then that's when this association -- if I said 16, I was in error.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

MS. SAMUELSON: Another circumstance showing suitability is that he understands and plans for the future. He has got real solid plans. Giving him a date at this time will make them even more solid. It will give him a chance to really make some decisions about his future life, even if it's a couple years from now.

His institutional behavior has been fine. You know, there hash t been any serious disciplinaries. There are a few minor disciplinaries, but no violent disciplinaries.

In whomen the processing term, assuming you

find him stable, a would probably place the crime in a similar category. But I believe that several mitigating circumstances exists the first one being that -- B category, which is the lower category. I think death was almost immediate. That kind of puts it down to one degree lower. And I think that you can make such a finding from the facts as related to you by Mr. Grogan. Also I believe another circumstance in mitigation would be that he participated under partially excusable circumstances; that is, he was under the influence of another person to some degree. He didn't have an apparent predisposition to do it on his own, probably wouldn't have done such a thing on his own if he had never met Manson. Aga his minimal history of criminal involvement and behavior. That it is a situation that's unusual and unlikely to recur, I think, is present also. He has no violent history at all, nothing before, nothing after, except for the incident of being attacked. His age at the time is very crucial. And I think also you can say that he committed the crime during a time in his. life with extreme pressure, stress, emotional trauma. also should mitigate. And I think that an appropriate term would be the lower in that category, which would be 13.

6

7

9

10

¥1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think the psych reports -- I think it's really unfair and inaccurate to rely so much on Dr. Malloy's report, considering the rest of the reports. I don't think

it's accurate to pull that one specific report out when you have got a real supportable basis of a progression, improvement, and you've got a 1978 report that's very positive. You've got a 1979 report that, with respect to the prior report, is also positive. And so I think that considering all of the factors that went into Dr. Malloy's report, including the fact that at the time Steve had not admitted his guilt, that could make a real difference in his interpretations of Steve's attitude and how he related to him. We don't know; we just don't know what went into it. But certainly the emphasis that's being placed on it is unwarranted, and you shouldn't just base your decision on this one report and justify it by this one report; without looking at the previous reports and the most current report and again the fact that Steve has initiated contact with Dr. Mattocks and he is involved in the Category E treatment at this time. Now, he is going to continue with that. Okay? And he will continue it if you find him suitable and give him a date. He will continue with it because he thinks it's important to himself.

5

10

11.

12

13

Î4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Cenying him a year to force him into a situation that he's going to, you know, be more encouraged to go to Dr. Mattocks, I don't think that that's a concern. I believe it's not a concern in this case. I have talked with Dr. Mattocks markels, and I believe that he is really sincerely

interested in talking with him for his own benefit. So to hold that kind of out there as a carrot I think is really counterproductive because I'm sure, as you know, when you give somebody a parole date, you're really giving them something to work with and probably increasing their chances of progressing at an even faster rate and becoming more able to deal with becoming a productive member of society again.

, 8

-16

20·

that in your decision you review the article that I submitted to you about cults, trying to incorporate that information when you review this other information so that you have a fuller understanding of all of the circumstances; and, you know, act courageously. Because I know it's a difficult decision considering the publicity. But I think it's justified. As the rabbi or the chaplain states, you know, he believes that whatever trust you put in him is justified. And I think that Steve is deserving of that trust and of a suitability finding and of a parole date.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I have one question.

I'm trying to separate in my mind one point you're trying to make. One of the reasons, or I guess the reason that the crime was committed, according to what we have heard today, is because Manson told him to do it. And whatever

1,3 1,4

last argument is that we shouldn't consider Manson when it comes time to decide whether he is eligible or should receive a parole date. Grant you, other crimes for which Manson we committed and this inmate was not should not ar into whatever the determination is in this particular case. But in fact Manson is a crime partner in the very murder we're talking about. And, according to this inmate, that's the reason that he did it. So I would have difficulty separating Manson from the murder for which this man is convicted.

ř

MS. SAMUELSON: Well, I'm trying to -- in separating Manson, I'm trying to separate Manson's notoriety.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: For the other crimes.

also trying to indicate to you that I believe there were a couple things that were going on at that time. Okay? It was Manson's influence definitely that had an effect on Steve. But I don't think you can say that the murder was senseless or without a motive on Steve's part because I think his involvement with Manson, his involvement with the Ranch made him feel like the victim was a threat. Okay? He may not have acted toward that victim who he perceived as a threat to the extent of murdering him had Manson not been there. But the fact is that he was, and so that is a

13 14

15.

16

17

18

19 20:

21

23

24

25.

den't think at a the only factor.

You can't really separate -- if you follow your argument, you can't really separate Manson from the crime for which you were committed because you're saying that he is an integral part of it.

MS. SAMUELSON: I guess what I'm trying to do is delete Manson from it, but put in the factor that there was an indoctrination process going on. Now, whether his name is Manson or Mooney or Reverend Sun or whitever, the fact is that his state at that time was suggestible due to his youth, due to the amount of drugs that they were taking, due to the psychological indoctrination that was taking place. And I think had that not happened, he wouldn't; have done the murder. But I think that the fact that Shea was involved to that extent in the situation there, rather than just being a person that walked on, and Manson told Steve to go kill this person he had never seen before — that's not what this case is about. You know, this is not the Tate case.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Panel members have any questions?

It's now approximately 4:50. We'll recess for purposes of arriving at a decision. We'll call you back .

h

--

PATRICIA SERVICIONE DE CONTRACTOR DE LA COMPONATION DE LA COMPONAT

in the somewhen a decision has been made.

the receiped the room was cleared, and the

Maring of the Community Release Board

recessed for deliberation by the Board.)

RESUMPTION OF PROCEEDINGS

---000---

The time is now approximately 5:52 p.m. All those present in the room at the start of the hearing are present in the room at this time.

The following is the decision of this panel in this case. And the decision is unanimous. And based on the following circumstance, the panel finds the prisoner unsuitable for parole at this time.

The prisoner committed the murder offense in an especially heinous, atrocious, and cruel manner. The prisoner first struck the victim on the head with a metal object which, coording to the prisoner, knocked the victim out of his vehicle. Subsequent to being knocked out of the vehicle by the prisoner, the victim was repeatedly stabbed. After killing the victim, his body was covered with leaves and left at the crime scene. Later that day the prisoner returned to the location of the crime and buried the body. The victim's body was not discovered or recovered until several years later when the prisoner, on his own volition, notified the authorities of the location of the body.

The execution-type offense was carried out in a manner which demonstrated advanced planning and callous

disregard for human suffering.

. 3

.,7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

J8

19

20

21

22

23

24

when the commitment offense is measured against the prisoner's subsequent institution adjustment, a further period of observation and evaluation is needed prior to setting, a release date.

Two, when the prisoner first arrived in CDC, his initial psychiatric diagnosis on 3/7/72 by Dr. Wittner was not clear. On 10/5/75 Dr. Wittner diagnosed the prisoner as suffering from schizophrenia, chronic, undifferentiated type, in partial remission, and that the prisoner had made no psychiatric gains. On 2/12/76 Dr. Wittner again diagnosed prisoner as suffering from schizophrenia, undifferentiated type, in good remission, and psychiatric progress to a moderate extent. On 10/5/75 Dr. J. Malloy diagnosed the prisoner as suffering from schizophrenia, undifferentiated type, violence potential well above average. On 12/2/77 Dr. E. Mackenberg diagnosed the prisoner as suffering from schizoid personality associated with dyssocial behavior. The prisoner was not viewed as an imminent menace at that point. Violence potential in the community was seen to be low to moderate. A course of therapy would be in the prisoner's best interest.

On 7/31/78 Dr. Macomber's diagnosed impression was a schizoid personality, improved. Prisoner has shown a considerable improvement. Violence petential appears below

average. On 1/13/79, after a Category D diagnostic study, Dr. B. Sanders' diagnostic impression was immature personality. Prisoner has psychiatrically improved moderately, likely to hold his present gains, recommend Category E as appropriate. And then Dr. T. Boody concurred in that impression. The prisoner is now receiving one-to-one therapy with Dr. Mattocks from 9/79 to present.

In view of the totality of the psychiatric record and the implications it raises concerning the prisoner's dependence and suggestibility, which appear to have played a large part in the murder, a further period of observation and treatment is warranted.

Recommendations to the prisoner. One is to continue in your therapy program. Two is to be disciplinary free. And three is to maintain your present institutional gains.

Any comment by the panel?

BOARD MEMBER COLLIER: I have none.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Mr. Vineyard?

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE VINEYARD: Except that one of the very few ways that the questions that do still exist of a psychiatric nature can be reconciled is through the prog not that you have just started with Dr. Mattocks. This will provide some of the answers and some of the clarifications needed.

discussion -- and it's obvious from the amount of time we took -- of what you have done and what you have not done and what you can do. You have made substantial institution progress. And in light of what other inmates do, you have made substantial institution progress. But you're coming from a long way considering the crime that was committed and how that crime was committed. And in view of all of the issues, the panel just couldn't make a finding, as required by law, that you are no longer a danger to the public at this time. We do recognize what you have done; that was not overlooked. You have done a substantial amount of things.

20:

Okay. It's now approximately six o'clock. This concludes the hearing.

I will tell you two things. First, you're entitled to another parole consideration hearing one year from now. You do have appeal rights to the decision that's made today which won't become final for 60 days. And those appeal rights are found in Section 2050 of the Community Release Board rules.

MS. SAMUELSON: Could I ask a question?
PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Yes, you may.

MS. SAMUELSON: With reference to maybe getting some further assistance, psychological or psychiatric

assistance from outside sources, do you know what response that would -- how the Board would receive that next time?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: What do you mean?

MS. SAMUELSON: If Mr. Grogan was able to obtain another source of commeling on the outside to come in on, say, a regular basis — I'm just trying to get from you what kind of attitude you have about that, whether you think that because the inmate is paying for it, they're going to say —

What my attitude would be? Why do that when the map who he is assigned to here on a one-to-one basis, which is very unusual, is probably one of the most outstanding people we have in working with people like this: Why spend his money for something else? And also you will find that Dr. Mattocks won't touch him if you want to duplicate the treatment that he's getting from him.

MS. SAMUELSON: I agree with you. But my concern is that Dr. Mattocks won't write a report. I was telking to him, and he --

MS. SAMUELSON: He feels like the best way he can assist somebody psychiatrically is to kind of stay out of that position. And he's kind of taking a position recently where he doesn't write reports. His contact with

the prisener is just on that basis, and somebody else does the Board report. And if that's going to happen, I see, like, Steve making more progress and it not showing up next year and getting another Board panel that reads the report that's equivocal in some respects. And then we go — I mean, to me, there is no insurance; and I'm trying to figure out some way, because I think ——

٠5

"10

1.1

13

ŧ5

16

17.

18

Z0

22

23

24

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: There isn't any insurance for what you're asking for. I don't think there is any insurance for what you're asking for. Some psychiatrist or some psychologist is going to make a report. And based upon that, what he says, along with all the other things that have been said -- and that's the thing we have been looking at today, is all of the things that were said right: from the beginning right up to where you are right now. And in terms of whether -- just to answer your question -specifically in terms of whether or not another psychiatrist can come in, the Board doesn't have a position on that. That isn't our position. It's whether the institution would let him in the institution. We don't really determine that issue. If there was another psychiatrist who were to write some kind of a paper or something and enbmit it to the Board next year to be reviewed, we'd look at it as we look at anything else that comes in from family members or anybody else. So it's not a case of us saying no.

he can't, because the Board doesn't have that position.

. 13

MS SAMUELSON: No, I know that. I know you wouldn't may that.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: The Board doesn't have that position. If he were a licensed psychologist or a licensed psychiatrist, it would be received and evaluated just like everything else we're looking at.

MS. SAMUEISON: Yes. I guess I was just asking for some statement.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: I think it's a legitimate question because occasionally someone wants a separate diagnosis. But the Board doesn't have a position, no, you can't go outside and --

MS. SAMUELSON: I know that wouldn't be a written policy. I guess I was expecting you to just tell me, you know, what your attitude is. I guess that's asking too much.

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Well, you're asking us to make the decision before we have the evidence.

MS. SAMUELSON: Another guestion I had with respect -- and it bothers me that the words that are being used to characterize the offense are so drastic. (And, you know, like I said before, every murder is heinous; every murder is brutal. Could you elaborate on what kinds of things you're looking at when you characterize that?

PRESIDING MEMBER BROWN: Just the things that led to the murder and how the murder happened and what happened after it. Now, how -- other than just taking the words that we have used, I don't know how I can give you any better explanation. I think it's the English meaning of the words.

> This concludes the hearing. (Thereupon the hearing before the Community Release Board adjourned at 6:02 p.m.)

3

11Q

11

12

13

14

†5

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

 \circ 0 \circ

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, PRANCES ANN PETERSON, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing Community Release Board Hearing was reported in shorthand by me, Frances Ann Peterson, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

Š

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said hearing, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this American of November, 1979.

FRANCES ANN PETERSON
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 4379

PETERS SHOW MAND PROPERTIES CORPORATION

THE PROPERTY OF THE AGE.