やさしい法律英語
その4
—O.J. Simpson裁判を追って—
その1
刑事裁判における無罪判決が出るまで

河野 護

序

1994年6月12日夜、アメリカン・フットボール界の元スーパースター、O.J. Simpsonの前妻 Nicole Brown Simpson とその友人 Ronald Goldman が何者かにより殺害された。筆者はこの事件発生直後より、ほとんど連日、主に CNN テレビを見て、その後の Simpson の行動や犯人捜査の過程を追っていった。この事件は超有名人に関わる事件であったため、始めから異常な反響を起こし全米、否、全世界の注目を集めるようになっ
た。Simpson は失踪後、テレビ放映されたあの派手なカーチェイスの後、舞戻った自宅で容疑者として逮捕された。その後の裁判も「世紀の裁判」と言われて、この事件とともに全国民の注目を集めるようになり、逮捕から裁判に至るまで1年4ヶ月（公判9ヶ月）という長期にわたる裁判となっ
た。

筆者はその間この裁判に関わる CNN のニュースをできる限り録画し、ニュースウィークやタイムの週刊誌、および、インターネットより得られ
る CNN の放送原稿や各種の英語の文字ニュースなどを取材源として、
多くの資料を集めた。

この拙稿において、筆者は、今回収集した英語資料のうち法律関係の英語を習得するのに重要かつ興味があると思われる資料を、法学部学生のた
めに、この紀要の場を借りて掲載しておきたいと考えた。この号では、まず、事件発生から1995年10月3日に出た刑事裁判の無罪評決までをその1としてまとめる。民事裁判の公判およびその前後の経過についてはその2として次号に掲載したいと考えている。

筆者は法律に関してはまったくの素人である。法律の専門知識は皆無に近い。にもかかわらずこのような執筆を試みるのは、法学部の学生に日常生活において頻繁に起こる法律関係事件に接して法律関係の英語表現そのものをすこしでも早く習得してもらいたいためである。したがって、法律専門家の方々が読まれた場合不適切な日本語訳が各所にあることによることが考えられる。筆者は、日本における正しい法律専門用語を訳としてあげているのではなく、法律英語に慣れていない学生に気安く読んでもらえるように、また、意味を捉える上で助けになると思われる日本語の語句を、英語の法律関係語句や難しいと思われる語句に、添えたに過ぎない。法律専門の方々から誤りをご指摘いただければ幸いである。

この拙文が本法学部学生諸君の英語への興味を喚起し英語習得の助けに多少ともなり得れば幸甚である。

I. 殺人前後の出来事

以下の英文は、公判中に証人によってなされた証言の内容を Court Law Center が結審後判例として簡略に整理しインターネット上に公表したものである。事件の流れ（timeline）を追ってみる。

The following is the sequence of events on the night of June 12, 1994 and early morning hours of June 13, based on the testimony of witnesses. O.J. Simpson has said he was at his Brentwood home waiting for a limousine at the time the victims were fatally stabbed. All times are Pacific Time (Pacific Daylight-saving Time).
6:30 pm – Nicole Brown Simpson, her children and several others go to dinner at the Mezzaluna restaurant.
8 pm – Nicole Brown Simpson and her children leave Mezzaluna, and stop for ice cream on the way home.
9:15 pm – One of Nicole Simpson’s sisters calls Mezzaluna to say that Nicole’s mother had left her glasses at the restaurant. Ronald Goldman volunteers to return the glasses.
9 pm–9:30 pm – Brian Kaelin, a friend staying in a guest house at O. J. Simpson’s home, and Simpson go to McDonald’s for dinner.
9:45 pm – Kaelin and Simpson return home.
9:45 pm–9:50 pm – Goldman leaves the restaurant with a white envelope containing the glasses.
10:15 pm – While watching television, Pablo Fenjves, a neighbor of Nicole Brown Simpson, hears the cries and constant barking of a dog.
10:25 pm – Limousine driver Allan Park arrives at Simpson’s home.
10:40 pm – Kaelin hears three loud thumps (ドンドンとたたくような音) on an outside wall of his room.
10:40 pm–10:50 pm – Park buzzes intercom several times but does not get any response.
10:55 pm – Park calls his boss and tells him Simpson is not home.
He is told to wait until 11:15 since Simpson is always late. Shortly before 11 pm – Park sees a black person, six-feet, 200 pounds, walking across the driveway towards the house.
About 11 pm – Kaelin goes to the front of the house to check on the noise. He sees the limousine driver at the gate. Several seconds later, Park again buzzes the intercom and Simpson answers. He says he had overslept and just gotten out of the shower.
11 pm–11:15 pm – Simpson puts his bags in the limousine.
11:15 pm – Limousine leaves for Los Angeles Airport.
11:35 pm – Limousine arrives at airport. 11:45 pm – Simpson leaves on an American Airlines flight to Chicago.

12:10 am – The bodies of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman are discovered outside her townhouse.

About 5 am – Detectives (刑事) Mark Fuhrman and Philip Vannatter arrive at Simpson’s house.

5:15 am–5:30 am – The detectives examine an apparent bloodstain (血痕) on Simpson’s Ford Bronco.

5:40 am–5:50 am – Detective Fuhrman decided to jump the wall in order for police to get into the estate. Once on the grounds, the detectives awaken Simpson’s daughter, Arnelle, who is staying in a guest house. She takes the police to the house and telephones Cathy Randa, her father’s longtime assistant.

7 am–7:30 am – Detective Vannatter declared the area a crime scene (犯行現場) and goes to get a warrant to search the house (家宅捜査令状).

II. カーチェイス後逮捕まで

6月12日深夜の殺害前後から国民注視のカーチェイス後逮捕されるまでは、1994年8月24日号のニュースウィークの記事が詳しくかつわかりやすく経過を教えてくれる。前項と重複する12日は除いて6月13日以後についてのみ掲載する。事件後 Simpson はどのような日々を過ごしたのであろうか。

A Guide to the Simpson Case
Monday, June 13 All times are Pacific standard except where noted.

12:10 am The bodies of Nicole and Goldman are found at the bottom of the steps of her town house.
5:34–8:30(CDT (中部標準時)) O.J. arrives in Chicago, checks into the O'Hare Plaza–Hotel, where he had made reservations days earlier. (CDT=Central Daylight–saving Time)
7:40–8(CDT) Police notifies (知らせる) Simpson of his ex-wife’s death. O.J. checks out of hotel.
9:30(CDT) Police in Chicago search his hotel room. They find blood on a towel and sheets, and a broken glass.
9:41(CDT) Simpson catches a flight back to L.A. and goes home. Noon Police take O.J. to headquarters (警察本部) for several hours of questioning (取り調べ). His lawyer Howard Weizman says O.J. was home at the time of the murders.
Police collect evidence (証拠) from Simpson’s house, including tennis shoes and reportedly (報道によると) a bloody glove (血染めの手袋). They examine stains (血痕) on his driveway.

Tuesday, June 14
Police impound (差し押さえる) Simpson’s White Ford Bronco and continue searching (捜索) for evidence. Simpson spends the night with his two young children, Sydney, 9, and Justin, 5.

Wednesday, June 15
LAPD (ロサンゼルス市警本部) releases (公表する) report on an earlier episode of domestic violence (家庭内暴力) in the Simpson household. Heizman resigns (辞任する) Simpson’s lawyer, saying he is too busy and also a close personal friend. Robert Shapiro takes over (引き継ぐ). Private open–casket viewing of Nicole is held.

Thursday, June 16
Detectives interview witness who says the car in front of Nicole’s
condo matched O.J.'s.
11 am Simpson attends his ex-wife's memorial service and funeral.
8:30 pm Police tests show that the blood at the murder site（殺人現場）matches Simpson's type. Simpson spends the night at a secluded（人里離れた）San Fernando Valley house with friend Al Cowlings.

Friday, June 17
8:30 am LAPD calls Shapiro, saying that they are ready to charge（告発する）and arrest（逮捕する）Simpson.
9:30–noon Shapiro arrives at the house, as do four doctors and Robert Kardashian, a friend of Simpson's. Police want O.J. to surrender（出頭する）at 11 am.
Noon Police tell Shapiro time is up. O.J. is downstairs with Cowlings, “wailing”（わめきたてる）while the others are upstairs.
12:15 pm Police arrive. O.J., Cowlings and Cowlings's Ford Bronco are gone.
1:50 pm Police declare（言明する）O.J. is missing（行方不明）.
5:00 pm Shapiro holds a news conference, thinks O.J. is “suicidal（自殺の恐れあり）”: Simpson's letter claiming his innocence（無罪）is read.
5:56–7 pm Police, responding to a citizen's tip（情報）, pinpoint（特定する）the Bronco's location（位置）by tracing cellular-phone（携帯電話）calls. O.J. calls 911 from car, says he's armed [武装している], threatens to kill himself and asks to talk to his mother. Police start to follow the car. A homicide detective（殺人担当刑事）is able to talk intermittently with O.J. via cellular phone.
The Bronco pulls into the driveway of Simpson's home. Cowlings waves off an excited onlooker（野次馬）. After attempting to mediate（とるなす）, Cowlings eventually enter the house.
Police persuade（説得する）O.J. to come into the house. After being
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searched (取り調べる) he calls his mother, used the bathroom and drinks a glass of orange juice.
10:00 pm O.J. is booked (名前を記録する) at LAPD headquarters.

III. Simpson 逮捕される

6月17日の逮捕について CNN はインターネット上で次のように報道している。逮捕されたときの短いニュースを読んでみよう。

Friday, June 17

Simpson is charged (容疑をかける) with two counts (訴因) of murder with special circumstances (特別付帯状況付). He does not surrender (出頭する). He remains at-large (逃走中) and is declared a fugitive (逃走者). Approximately 6:45 pm, the police spot (所在確認する) a white Ford Bronco belonging to Simpson’s friend Al Cowlings on an expressway. Simpson is a passenger and reportedly has a gun. The two lead police on a 60–mile low speed pursuit [追跡].

Los Angeles. At 8:00 pm, the vehicle arrives at Simpson’s Brent-wood mansion. Negotiations [交渉] with Police begin. At 8:51 pm, O.J. Simpson surrenders, clutching a family photo. He is arrested and jailed (拘留する) without bail (釈放なしで).

IV. Simpson 罪状認否において100%無罪を主張

罪状認否については、7月24日の The Japan Times のニュースで読んでみよう。

O.J. Simpson confidently (確信を持って) declared at his arraignment (罪状認否) Friday that he is “absolutely, 100 percent not guilty (無罪)” of murdering his ex–wife and a friend of hers. Simpson spoke in a strong, clear voice that resonated (響きわたる) around the packed
courtroom（満員の法庭）when asked by Superior Court（高等裁判所） Judge Celil Mills how he pleaded（答弁する） to charges（容疑） of murdering Nicole Brown Simpson, 35, and 25-year-old waiter Ronald Goldman.

They were slashed（めった切りにする） and stabbed to death（刺殺する） outside the former wife’s Brentwood town house on the night June 12. Simpson, 47, a former football star who became a television and movie celebrity（有名人），claims（主張する） he was at home waiting for a limousine to take him to the airport at the time of the killings. Simpson’s appearance（出廷） at the arraignment（罪状認否手続） was in sharp contrast to the way he looked at his Municipal Court（市裁判所） arraignment June 21. Then, he looked dazed and confused, and did not wear tie, belt or shoelaces, because he was under a suicide watch（自殺監視中） at the men’s central jail（刑務所） in Los Angeles. On Friday, dressed in a dark suit, white shirt and tie, he looked alert and confident, smiling at Shapiro and even giving a thumb-up sign to someone in the gallery（傍聴人） after the hearing（審問） was over and he was being led out. Milles, the Superior Court’s supervising judge（上級判事）, appointed（任命する） his deputy（代理）, Lance Ito, as the trial judge（公判判事）. He said Ito would hold a hearing on motions（申し立て） filed（提出する） by both sides next Friday, when he will probably set a trial date（公判開始日）.

V. O.J. Simpson に対する逮捕状

以下は CNN のインターネット情報より入手した Simpson に対する逮捕状である。

The arrest warrant（逮捕状） in the O.J. Simpson Case
Felony Complaint (重罪告発) for Arrest Warrant, Case No. BA097211
The undersigned (下記署名者) is informed (通報する) and believes that:

COUNT (訴因) 1

On or about June 12, 1994, in the county of Los Angeles, the crime of murder (殺人罪), in violation (違反) of Penal Code (刑法) Section 187, a felony (重罪), was committed (犯す) by Orenthal James Simpson, who did willfully (故意に), unlawfully (違法に), and with malice aforethought (謀殺の意図をもって) murder Nicole Brown Simpson, a human being.

Notice: The above offense is a serious felony within the meaning of Penal Code Section 1192.7 (c) (1) (刑法1192条の7 C 項の1).

It is further alleged (申し立てる) that in the commission (実行) and attempted commission (実行の試み) of the above offense (上記犯罪), the said defendant (前記被告人), Orenthal James Simpson, personally used a deadly and dangerous weapon, to wit (即ち), knife, said use (前記使用) not being an element of above offense, within the meaning of Penal Code Section 12022 (b) and also causing the above offense to be a serious felony within the meaning of Penal Code Section 1192.7 (c) (23).

Count 2

On or about June 12, in the county of Los Angeles, the crime of murder, in violation of Penal Code Section 187 (a), a felony, was committed
by Orenthal James Simpson, who did willfully, unlawfully, an with
malice aforethought murder Ronald Lyle Goldman, a human being.

これ以降は訴因１の後半と同一のため省略する。全文の３分の１ほどに
あたる最終部分についてのみは訴因１と異なるため続けて記載する。

It is further alleged as to Count 1 and 2 the defendant has in this pro-
ceeding (訴訟) been convicted (有罪となる) of more than one offense
of murder in the first or 2nd degree murder (一級ないし二級殺人)
within the meaning of Penal Code 190.2 (a) (3).

Further, attached hereto (この文書に添付され) and incorporated herein
(この文書に含まれている) are official reports (公式報告書) and docu-
ments (文書) of a law enforcement agency (法執行機関) which the
undersigned believes establish probable cause (相当な理由) for the
arrest of defendant, Orenthal James Simpson, for the above-listed
crimes. Wherefore (その理由にて), a warrant of arrest is requested for
Orenthal James Simpson. I declare under penalty of perjury (犯せば
偽証罪になるという条件で) that the foregoing (上述の事項) is true and
correct and that this complaint (告発状), Case Number (訴訟番号)
BA097211, consists of 2 counts.

Executed (執行する) at Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, on June
17, 1994.
Phillip Vannater
(LAPD Robbery–Homicide detective (強盗殺人担当刑事))
Declarant (原告) and Complainant (告発人)
VI. 自殺メモ

事件および裁判の過程を追って資料を掲載していく予定で書き始めたが、ここで多少視点を変えて、Simpson がカーチェイスされているとき、「自殺する」と脅迫していたときにすでに書き残してあった 3 通のメモ（suicide notes と言われていて、自筆かどうかの疑いもある）のうち、一般社会の人たちに向けて書かれた手紙だけを読んでもらうことになる。この 3 通の手紙の朗読は、当時の主任弁護士 Robert Shapiro（後に Jonnie Cochran に代わる）の司会のもと、O.J. の友人であり私選弁護人である Robert Kardarshian がテレビ放送を通じて全米に語りかけ、多くの国民の関心（同情）を集めたものである。

O.J.’s Suicide Note

To Whom It May Concern:
First, everyone understand. I have nothing to do with Nicole’s murder. I loved her; always have and always will. If we had a problem, it’s because I loved her so much.
Recently, we came to the understanding that for now we were not right for each other, at least for now. Despite our love, we were different and that’s why we mutually agreed to go our separate way.
It was touch splitting for a second time, but we both knew it was for the best. Inside, I had no doubt that in the future we would be close friends or more. Unlike what has been written in the press, Nicole and I had a great relationship for most of our lives together. Like all long-term relationships, we had a few downs and ups.
I took the heat (罪を受ける) New Year’s 1989 because that’s what I was supposed to do. I did not plead (申立てる) no contest (異議) for any other reason but to protect our privacy and was advised it would
end the press hype (マスコミによる誇大宣伝).

I don't want to belabor (長々と…し続ける) knocking the press, but I can't believe what is being said. Most of it is totally made up (事実無根). I know you have a job to do, but as a last wish, please, please, please leave my children in peace. Their lives will be tough enough.

I want to send my love and thanks to all my friends. I'm sorry name every one of you, especially A.C. Man, thanks for being in my life. The support and friendship I received from so many: Wayne Hughes, Lewis Marks, Frank Olsen, Mark Packer, Bender, Bobby Kardarshian. I wish we'd had spent more time together in recent years. My golfing buddies: Hoss, Alan Austin, Mike, Craig, Bender, Wyler, Sandy, Jay, Donnie, thanks for the fun.

All my teammates over the years: Reggie, you were the soul of my pro career. Ahmad, I never stopped being proud of you. Marcus, you've got a great lady in Catherine, don't mess it up. Bobby Chandler, thanks for always being there. Skip and Kathy, I love you guys. Without you I never would have made it through this for ....

VII. 予備審問から評決発表まで

1996年6月、中央公論社より和久俊三他著『無罪評決』が出版された。その216—225ページによると裁判の過程は以下のようであった。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994年7月22日</th>
<th>予備審問開始 罪状認否でシンプソン否認</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9月26日</td>
<td>陪審員選任開始</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11月7日</td>
<td>陪審員12名 補充陪審員12名選任</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1995年1月11日</th>
<th>陪審員団隔離開始</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1月23日</td>
<td>公判実質審理開始</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1月24日</td>
<td>検察側意見陳述</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1月25日</td>
<td>弁護側意見陳述</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10月3日 無罪判決発表

**VIII. 本裁判に要した諸データ一覧**

評決が朗読された10月3日現在、それまでに要した日数や費用等の諸データをCNNはインターネット情報として公表した。興味ある数字のみを以下に上げる。

**Figures（データ）from the Simpson murder trial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days O.J. Simpson spent in jail</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days since jury selection began</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days jurors were sequestered</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution witnesses (検察側証人)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense witnesses (弁護側証人)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of prosecution testimony (証言)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of defense testimony</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution exhibits (証拠品)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense exhibits</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motions filed (申立件数)</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution attorneys (弁護士)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense attorney</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution costs (検察側経費)</td>
<td>$9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense costs</td>
<td>$4–7 million (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurors’ earnings (陪審員手当)</td>
<td>$5/day, $1,330 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript (聴取記録) pages</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media credentials (保証書)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution fines (検察側罰金)</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense fines</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fines</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IX. 検察側による冒頭陳述

法廷内ではどのような英語が話されているのであろうか。法律専門書に書かれているような専門用語ばかりが使われているのではないであろう。法廷では市民の法律上の問題が争われているのであろうから平易な会話調の応酬も多いことであろう。ここでは、まず、専門家としての検察官による冒頭陳述（その主要部分のみ）をウエストロー・データベースから得た資料で読んでもらうことにする。検察側はどのような理論を立てているのであろうか。

THE COURT（判事）：All right. Ms. Clark, are you ready to proceed (始める)？ Are we ready to proceed?

MS. CLARK：All right.

(Whereupon（この時）the jury entered the room.)

THE COURT：Counsel（弁護士の方々）, be seated（ご着席下さい）.

Ladies and gentlemen. Thank you. Back on the record in the Simpson matter. Mr. Simpson is again present before the Court with his counsel, The People（検察側）are represented（代理出席する）and we have all the members of our jury panel（陪審員団）again present with us. Ms. Clark, do you wish to continue your opening statement（冒頭陳述）?

MS. CLARK：Thank you, Your Honor（判事に対する呼びかけ）

THE COURT：All right.

MS. CLARK：Good afternoon everyone.

THE JURY：Good afternoon.

I hope you all had a very good lunch. Let me remind you of where we left off（どこで終わったか）so we can pick up from there. We were talking about the timing, and I was discussing with you that Kato had last seen the defendant at 9:35 at Rockingham, and that it was
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after 11 before he saw him again. So he saw the defendant at 9:35, did not see him again until after 11. And during that period of time the defendant's whereabouts are unaccounted for. Now, the last I spoke to you, Kato was on the phone with his girlfriend Rachel Ferrara. At that time, at the same time that he was on the telephone — and this was approximately 10 to 10:15 — Allan Park, a limousine driver, was on his way to Rockingham to pick up the defendant to take him to the airport where he would take his flight at 11:45 to Chicago. Although his instructions were to arrive at Rockingham at 10:45, he hadn't been in the Brentwood area before and he didn't want to be late; so he left early, and he arrived at Rockingham at 10:25.

Now I'm going to use the diagram again. When Allan Park pulled up on a Ashford Street, he parked across the street from the defendant's residence, got out of his car and sat behind it on the curb and had a cigarette. He got back in his car about 10:30, sat in his car from a few minutes listening to the radio. And at 10:35 he decided he would go and look at the Rockingham gate to see if that drive-in would be easier for him than the Ashford Street gate. What I should tell you right here is that he was driving a stretch limousine, and it has a very hard time making tight curbs.

He wanted to be able to pull up to the front door so it would be easy to load the baggage. So he wanted to see if the Rockingham address would be more easy for him than the Ashford. So he decided to pull down to Rockingham, pulled the limousine down to Rockingham, all the way down to the point where the driver's side window would be parallel with the Rockingham gate. And so he could look inside. Now, in doing that, he had to pass right by the curb area just north of the...
Rockingham gate. And what he noticed when he pulled to that area that was right in his field of view is that there was no car parked there, no white Ford Bronco, and it was 10:39. That's very important. We'll come back to that again. He looked down the driveway, and he saw that that looked like a tighter turn even than Ashford.

So he backed the limousine up Rockingham Avenue and made a left turn onto the Ashford Street and pulled right up to the Ashford gate. When I say he pulled right up to the Ashford gate, on this photograph you see the Ashford gate of residence. He actually had the grill (高級車の自動車前面にある格子) of the car almost touching the gate, facing inward toward it.

THE COURT: Photograph?

MS. CLARK: I thought we gave it to the Court.

MR. FAIRLOW: It is P (写真番号) 29.

MS. CLARK: Your Honor, so the Court won't have to the in inquire every photograph, we've given you a list for each and every one.

THE COURT: I think you should make the record (記録する), Counsel. You should tell us which this is. Because the clerk has the list, she can't see directly the video. So you need to tell me which graph we're using.

MS. CLARK: Very well, Your Honor. I'll ask that John Fairlow be allowed to.

THE COURT: Thank you. Now, when Allan Park pulled back to the Ashford gate parking, backed up against it, facing into the driveway, he looked at his watch and it was 10:40 pm And at that point he decided to go and ring the buzzer. I wanted to show you something else on there so you'll know what I talk about when I say ring the buzzer.

With this red light you can see right here, that's the call box where you'd be pressing the buzzer and it rings inside the house. The
person inside can then press a button to open the gate. At 10:40 he began to ring the buzzer. He could hear it sound but there was no answer. There were lights on in the upstairs, one light on upstairs. There were no lights on downstairs. It seemed to him like no one was home. And he was a little worried about that so he decided to page his boss and find out if perhaps the plans had changed. At 10:43 he paged (無線電話をかける) his boss. He was then worried that perhaps the page didn’t go through so at 10:49 he called his boss at home but there was no answer. He then got out and pushed the buzzer at the Ashford gate a few more times. Still got no answer. Now, during this period of time, Kato is still in his room on the phone with his girlfriend Rachel. Now, what I haven’t explained to you yet, this area here shown is the southern border of the defendant’s property (敷地). This is a walkway here, but it’s not like a sidewalk, it’s very narrow and it’s very dark. Just a few feet wide, covered with leaves, it has the shrubbery (生け垣) that’s indicated here is actually from the neighbor’s yard and there’s a chain link fence the shrubbery is right up against it. It overhangs the walk to make it very dark.

Here you can see what’s indicated as the air conditioner. I don’t know if you can all read it, that’s what’s written here, this little black box here. This air conditioner actually hangs over the walkway quite a bit. It’s an air conditioner that is set into Kato’s wall so you can see the air conditioner on the inside and then it hangs outside the wall, outside the house over that walkway.

So that this wall of Kato’s room faces on to the south walkway. There’s no entry or exit there. He can’t go out that way. If he wants to exit his room, he has to exit through the doors that are right here. They’re like shuttered doors, a door like shutters, and he goes out through those shuttered doors to the pool area and that’s how he exits.
So on that night, he's on the phone with his girlfriend Rachel. Okay. What's indicated here P what?

MR. FAIRLOW : P4.

MS. CLARK : What's indicated here is the area I just described to you. You see the shrubbery from the neighbor's yard and the chain link fence and this is the air conditioner right here that I'm circling, that air conditioner to Kato's room to his wall. This is the wall way. You can see how dark and narrow it is. This is a shot taken during the daytime.

At 10:45 Kato is talking to his girlfriend Rachel when suddenly he heard on the wall where the air conditioner was three loud thumps. The thumps were so loud that a picture on that wall actually moved. Kato was alarmed (驚く). He asked Rachel, “Have we had an earthquake?” When she said she hadn't felt any he became even more alarmed. And then he wondered if there might be a prowler, somebody trying to break in because if it wasn't a earthquake, that's what it had to be. He was worried about the sounds he had heard. He was worried about those thumping noises and so he decided that even though he was afraid and it was late at night and it was dark, he should go and see what the cause of those noises might be. A few minutes later he hung up with Rachel and went out of his room to go and look.

MR. FAIRLOW : P6.

MS. CLARK : This is a picture of Kato's room. Right up here where I'm indicating, that's the air conditioner in the wall. The part of the wall that you can't see on this photograph which is actually over here, the opposite side of the bed is where the picture was hanging that moved when the thumps were made.

And now the shuttered doors I referred to, you can see them here at
the left edge of this photograph. You can see them better here. This is taken from the head of the bed facing outward. These are the shuttered doors that lead out to the pool area.

MR. FAIRLOW : P5.

MS. CLARK : He walked out of those shuttered doors and out through the pool area, coming out on to the side lawn that borders Ashford Street. When he came out to that side yard, he saw the limousine that was pulled up to the Ashford gate but he figured that the defendant had already made contact with him, was about to let him in any way and didn’t pay any further attention because he was very distracted by what the cause of those noises might be.

Now, with him he had a little dim flashlight that he was going to use to try and see what was going on back there in the dark. In the meantime, just before Kato came out on to the side yard, Allan Park was standing at the Ashford gate ringing the buzzer, still getting no answer.

Finally, he heard the car phone ringing inside his car and it was 10 : 52. He had still received no answer to the buzzing at the Ashford gate. Got back into the car and spoke to his boss telling his boss I don’t think anybody’s home. What shall I do? His boss told him to wait a little longer and when he’d been speaking to his boss for 3 minutes he saw Kato coming out the side yard with his little flashlight.

Almost simultaneously the — with seeing Kato in the side yard he saw a person 6 foot tall, 200 pounds wearing all dark clothing African American walk quickly up the driveway and into the front door entrance. Immediately as that person entered the house the downstairs lights went on. Allan Park hung up the phone and walked over to the Ashford gate and buzzed again. This time, he got an answer. And the defendant said a voice said Allan could recognize as the
defendant's, the defendant said sorry I over slept. I just got out of the shower. I'll be down in one minute. Now, Kato who was distracted by the possibility of a prowler (こぞドロ) wasn't looking to see if anyone was coming and didn't see. And although Allan Park could not see well enough at the time the person entered the house who identified who it was, clearly that was the defendant.

Now, while Allan was standing at the gate speaking to the defendant on the intercom, Kato decided to walk around to the south side of the garage and he was going to attempt to go down that narrow walkway to see what had happened. But when he got actually back to this corner of the garage with that little dim flashlight it was very dark and he was scared so he decided not to and he came back around.

When he came back around he realized that the limo driver was still outside the gate. So even though the defendant had spoken to him and said he was coming down, he did not open the gate for him. Kato had to go and open the gate.

He opened the gate and he let him pull in. As soon as Allan Park pulled the limousine into the driveway, Kato who was still very worried about the sounds started talking to him telling him he heard the thumps on the wall.

(1:51 PST)

His picture moved. He thought it might be a prowler or maybe was it an earthquake has Allan felt an earthquake. Allan said, “No, I haven't.” Kato was very nervous, but now with Allan pulled into the driveway and inside the grounds (屋敷), he felt a little safer. So Kato decided to go back to the area and try and check out the sounds and what had caused them. He went back to the south side of the garage he went through a first gate that basically you just lift and push gets (gates) against the wall it's not a locking get(gate). Went up as far as
the second gate but couldn't see anything of. It was still dark the the flashlight was very dim and he decided to come back. He was still too afraid to go back there by himself.

Kato came back out around the garage and when he came out. He saw that the defendant had come out of the house by that time. Defendant was now wearing a light blue denim shirt and light blue denim jeans. As he came out, Kato also noticed that there was a small dark bag placed near where the Rolls Royce — excuse me, the Bentley was park.

Remember I told you defendant parked his Bentley this way facing out towards Rockingham. He could see there was a small dark bag on the grass near that Bentley. While — it was Allan Park and Kato who were loading all of the bags into the limousine.

And while they were loading the bags into the limousine Kato spoke again of the thumps that he had heard and being worried that it was a prowler thinking that it might have been an earthquake, hoping, I guess, that it was an earthquake. So he asked the defendant for a better flashlight so he could go around to the back area and check out the source of those sounds again.

He and the defendant then walked into the house very briefly, but then the defendant, “Oh, it's late. I got to go.” And came back out. While they were loading the bags, Kato offered to go and get that small dark bag on the grass and put it in the car for the defendant. Unlike any of the other bags the defendant said “No, no, no. I'll go get it.” He went and got the bag. The defendant got the bag and put it into the car.

Now, the defendant did not give Kato a better flashlight. And when he left, although Kato seemed very concerned about the thumps, the defendant seemed relatively unconcerned (気にしていない). He got
into the limousine and they left for the airport at approximately 11:15. Let me back up for a minute.

(1:55 PST)
Just before he left, the defendant asked Kato to set the alarm. Kato said he didn't want to do that. He'd never set the alarm before. He didn't know the code felt very uncomfortable with the responsibility. Told the defendant, "No, I really don't want to do that." The defendant then left. They took off, they left out the Rockingham gate at 11:15. Kato went back to his room to call back his girlfriend, Rachel Ferrara, as he promised to do.

On the way to the airport the defendant repeatedly complained of being hot. Allan Park could see that he was sweating. And he rolled down the windows and turned on the air conditioner. The temperature that night was 63 degrees.

During that drive to the airport, Allan could see that the defendant was moving around with his bags in the passenger compartment, although he couldn't see exactly what he was doing.

They arrived at the airport at 11:30. And that small dark bag that the defendant insisted on putting in the car himself was never seen again after the defendant left for Chicago.

Now, during the time the defendant was driving to the airport, Kato was on the phone again with his girlfriend Rachel. During that phone call, there was a call waiting interruption (割り込み), call was interrupted by the defendant.

The defendant told him, "I need you to set the alarm. I forgot to set the alarm." He had to give Kato the security code (暗証番号) and tell him where to go and set alarm. There was a keypad (キー操作パネル) outside the front entrance, the front door.

(1:56 PST)
Now in the six months the defendant — Kato had been living there, the defendant had never asked him to set the alarm before, had never had to give him the security code before. This was the very first time that had ever happened.

Now, at this point we know the following: I talk to you about the timing again.

(1:57 PST)

Kato last saw the defendant at 9:35, when he was — he was standing by that black Bentley after they had come back from McDonald’s. 40 minutes later, at 10:15, we hear Nicole’s dog barking that loud insistent bark that went on and on and on. And it would be safe to assume (推定する) that it was very shortly within that period of time that the murders occurred.

When Allan Park drove over to Rockingham and saw that the defendant’s Bronco was not there at the Rockingham gate. It was 10:39 so we know that the defendant had not yet returned home. The drive to — between Rockingham and Bundy was timed (時間を計る), taking a normal rate of speed between the hours of 9:30 and 10:30 at night, it took approximately six minutes. Just so you can see the relationship of the two locations.

(1:58 PST)

Here is Nicole’s condominium (マンション), 875 South Bundy. Here is the defendant’s residence, 360 North Rockingham.

THE COURT: For the record, this is a blowup (引き伸ばし写真) of the Thomas Brothers map.

MS. CLARK: Yes, map of the Brentwood area.

(1:59 PST)

So at 9:35 last sighted the defendant. 40 minutes later at 10:15 the dog is barking, Nicole’s dog barking. 10:45, half hour later, we hear
the thumps on the wall. This leaves us between 9:35 and 10:45 for the defendant to drive from Rockingham to Bundy and back, a total of 12 minutes, which leaves him a full hour to commit the murders.

以下に、さらに血染めの手袋や DNA 血液鑑定の結果等の陳述が延々と続く冒頭陳述であったが、これ以上掲載することは我々の注意集中的の限度を超えてしまうであろう。この陳述がどのように終わったのか、検察側陳述の最後の部分を示してこの項を終えることにする。

Ladies and gentlemen, if those words are to mean anything, we must all be equal in the eyes of the law and we cannot use a sliding scale (計算尺) to judge guilt or innocence based on a defendant or a victim’s popularity. We live in very, very strange times.

DEFENSE ATTORNEY: Closing —

THE COURT: This has all been argument (主張) for the last five minutes.

MS. CLARK: I’ll wrap-up (終える), Your Honor.

MS. CLARK: We can not succumb (負ける) to the temptation (誘惑) to thwart (挫折させる) justice and throw truth out the window.

THE COURT: I’m going to stop you right here. I’ve warned (警告する) you three times now.

MS. CLARK: All we’re asking —

THE COURT: Counsel, I’m warning you. I’ve warned you three times now.

MS. CLARK: I’m concluded right now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. All we ask is that you stay focused on what the case is about, about the murder of Ron Goldman and Nicole Brown. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Your Honor. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for your kind attention in this matter and to thank you also on behalf of all of us for putting up with the rigors of sequestration. We all know it’s difficult and we appreciate all of your dedication to duty and service in this case. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Clark. All right, ladies and gentlemen, I think we will take your recess just a little bit early. Let me ask Deputy Magnera how much time do we need? About 25 minutes. All right. We’ll reconvene at 25 minutes after 3:00. All right. Thank you.

(3:25 PST)

(Court’s microphone muted)

(Bench discussion.)

(Proceedings adjourned at 3:44 pm PST.)
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X. リムジーン・ドライバーの証言

陪審員たちは、運転手アラン・パーク氏の証言は事件当夜の Simpson のアリバイに関する極めて重要な証言と判断して、評決決定直前に最終確認のためイトー判事にその証言記録の朗読を要求した。評決一致に至った朗読前日の10月2日のことである。パーク氏の証言には Simpson の有罪を決定的にするような証言が含まれていると判断し、陪審員は最終確認を要求したのである。証人尋問がどのように行われるのか、法廷内における尋問の雰囲気を体験してみることにする。ただし、全文は相当長いので大幅に省略して主要箇所のみを読む。運転手の証言を通じて検察側が主張す
THE COURT: Mr. Simpson is again present before the Court with his counsel, Mr. Douglas. People represented by Mr. Hodgman and Mr. Darden. Jury and alternates are not present.

Counsel, we have a request for read back (再朗読) from the jury and the request has been shown to counsel for both parties (双方). However, for the record, it reads as follows:

We the jury in the above-entitled action request the following: Testimony (証言) from March 28, 1995 of Allan Park.

The request is dated today and is signed by the foreperson (陪審長), juror number 1. And, Mr. Douglas, you've discussed this matter with your client (依頼人)?

MR. DOUGLAS: I have, Your Honor. And, Your Honor, I'm told that
the 28th (28日の審理) stops in the middle of cross-examination (反対尋問). I would, therefore, ask that the entire cross (cross examinationのこと), redirect (redirect examinationのこと, 再直接尋問) and recross (recross examinationのこと, 再反対尋問) be read, as well.

THE COURT: Any comment, Mr. Darden?
MR. DARDEN: (Inaudible) — any more than they asked for because — inaudible.

THE COURT: All right. My inclination is to give them the entire testimony, since it would be incomplete to give them just the one part. All right. And Deputy Terrara, let’s have the jurors, please.
(1:04 PST)
(Jury enters.)
(1:05 PST)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, please be seated. And let the record reflect (記録しましょう) that we’ve now been rejoined by all the members of our jury panel and our two alternates. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I have received from your foreperson, juror number 1, a request to have the testimony from March 28, 1995 of Allan Park reread to you. And ladies and gentlemen, the testimony of Mr. Park on March 28 concludes at the end of the Court day in the midst of the cross-examination.

So I’m going to ask the court reporter (記録係) to conclude reading through the end of the cross-examination so that you have a complete picture of the testimony of Mr. Park. All right.

Madam court reporter, would you please commence (始める). And the record should reflect, I believe, that we are starting after the issuance of the oath (宣誓の後に) at page 2510 of the record, is that correct, madam court reporter?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, Your Honor. Direct examination by Ms.
Clark.
(The following is an excerpt (抜粋) of Allan Park's testimony read back by the court reporter.)

Q (By Ms. Clark) good morning, Mr. Park.
A Good morning.
Q Sir, as of June 12 (6月12日現在), can you tell us where you are employed?
A I was employed for Town & Country Limousine.
Q Let me push that microphone a little closer. Try and talk into it like a telephone. As of June 12, 1994, you were employed where?
A For Town & Country Limousine.
Q As what, sir?
A As a limousine driver.
（省略）
Q On the date of June 12, 1994, did you have an order for a pick-up on that date for the evening to go to the airport?
A Ah, yes, I did.
Q What was your order?
A My order was to pick up Mr. Simpson at 360 Rockingham.
Q At what time?
A 10 : 45.
Q 10 : 45?
A Yes.
Q And did you — were you made aware of what flight you had to get him to?
A Not a flight number, but just to get him to LAX (ロサンゼルス空港) for an 11 : 45 flight out from American Airlines.
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Q  And were you aware of where that flight was going to?
A  I believe Chicago.
（省略）
Q  Can you tell us, sir, at what time you left to pick up Mr. Simpson to take him to the airport on June 12?
A  What time I left my place?
Q  Yes.
A  Ah, it was about 9:45.
（省略）
Q  Okay. Now, were you scheduling yourself to arrive exactly at 10:45?
A  No, I wasn’t.
Q  What time were you scheduled to actually arrive there?
A  Well, they like us to be there 10 minutes early.
Q  So what time were you trying to arrive at the defendant’s house in Brentwood?
A  10:35.
（省略）
Q  During your drive to the residence, sir, is that car — that limo that you were driving that night, that stretch limo, is it equipped with a cell phone（携帯電話）?
A  Yes, it is.
Q  And is it the kind of phone that is fixed in the car or can you remove it and take it around with you?
A  It’s fixed in the car.
Q  Did you receive any phone calls during your trip to Rockingham?
A  Ah, from what I remember, I received one from Dale just —
Q  I’m sorry, Dale St. John?
Q  That was your boss?
A  Yes.

Q  He called you in the car while you were enroute (途中) to Rockingham?
A  Yes.

Q  All right. Do you recall what time it was when you drove — when you indicated to us just now you turned right up onto Rockingham and drove up Rockingham, do you recall what time it was when you got to the location on Rockingham or the defendant's house was?
A  It had to have been around 9:22, 9:23.
Q  9:22?
A  No, excuse me, 10:22, 10:23, I'm sorry. (省略)

Q  And then what did you do?
A  I got out of the car and walked toward the back and had a cigarette. And when I was done, I got back in the car and listened to the radio a little bit.

Q  Okay. What time was it when you parked on Ashford?
A  When I parked on Ashford?
Q  Yes.
A  It was 10:25. (省略)

Q  All right. And when you got to the location where the arrow has stopped on Ashford Street, sir, what time was it?
A  It was 10:25.
Q  And how do you know that?
A  I looked at my watch and there's also a clock on the radio.
Q: In the car?
A: Yes.
Q: And was the clock in the car the same time as your watch?
A: Yeah, give or take a minute or so.
Q: All right. And what happened next after you parked, what did you do?
A: I got outside. I walked towards the back of the car, had a cigarette. I got back inside the car, listened to the radio for a few minutes. And then just at about 10:39 I proceeded to drive up to the driveway.
Q: Okay. So you smoked a cigarette, listened to the radio and then got back inside?
A: Yes.
Q: After you got back inside, did you look at the clock again?
A: Yes, I did. I wanted to make sure that I was right on (主義に則って) my 10 minutes early (10分早く到着する主義).
Q: Okay. And you got back into the car at what time?
A: It was around 10:39.
Q: 10:39?
A: Yes.
Q: And how do you know that?
A: From looking at the clocks.
(Q省略)
Q: Okay. And as you pulled down Rockingham this time going southbound on Rockingham and looked into the Rockingham gate, did you see any car, white Bronco, parked to the left of the gate as you faced it?
A: No, I didn't.
(Q省略)
Q (By Ms. Clark, continuing) When you pulled up to the Ashford gate, sir, the location shown by the green arrow, can you tell us what time it was?
A That was at 10:40.
Q And how do you know that?
A Because I looked at the clocks again.
Q I'm sorry?
A I looked at my watch and the clock again.
Q And the clock?
A Yeah.
Q You looked at your clock and your watch a lot that night?
A A lot.
Q Why is that?
A Because when you're a limo driver, you're set pretty much on schedules, so you're looking to see if you're on time, how long you have to get to the airport, things like that.
Q Now, you indicated, I think, that you turned off your headlights and you left only your parking lights on?
A Yes.
Q All right. At 10:40?
A Yes.
Q And what happened next?
A That is it when I got out of the car. And there is an intercom at the gate and I was using that intercom to buzz the house and I buzzed it and there was no answer. I proceeded to buzz it a few more times. There was still no answer. So I — that's when I decided to get back in the car and call my boss's Voice Mail.
Q Okay. When you — was it something you pressed, a button you pressed?
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A I think it was a button, yes.
Q And when you pressed that button, could you hear a sound?
A Yeah, it — it made a ringing or a buzzing noise.
Q Do you remember whether it was ringing or buzzing?
A No.
Q Okay, but it was a sound?
A Yes.
Q How many times did you press the button at 10:40?
A It was a good two or three, four times.
Q And did you get any answer?
A No, I didn’t.
Q So after you pressed the buzzer two or three or four times and
  got no answer, what happened next?
A That’s what I stepped back into the car and used the cell phone
to call my boss’s Voice Mail.
Q All right. Now, you indicated to us earlier, sir, that you — that
  there was a phone in that limousine?
A Yes, there was.
Q And you just indicated now that you used that phone?
A Yes.
Q And who did you call?
A I called my — I was trying to get a hold of (連絡をとる) my
  boss, Dale St. John, which ended up being his Voice Mail, it’s
  his business line
(業務用電話).
Q I’m going to show you phone records (電話使用記録), sir.

MS. CLARK: Your Honor, I have here a photocopy (コピー)
— of a phone bill (電話料金請求書) of a marking —
THE COURT: People’s next in order (検察側の次の証拠物
(69) — 112
件）is 148.

MS. CLARK: People's 148. I'll be marking a different copy of this same for actual admission at some point.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CLARK: For now I'll just use a Xerox if that's all right.

Q (By Ms. Clark, continuing) Sir, I'm directing your attention to this document in front of you and I'm going to be asking you a few questions about it. Do you see here an entry for June 12 '94 the time 22:05:36?

A Yes, I do.

Q First of all, are you familiar with military versus regular time?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And 22:05:36, would that be 10:05 and 36 seconds pm?

A Yes, it would.

Q All right. Does that show a phone call placed to and from a given number here?

A Yes, it does.

Q Okay. The numbers stated here for this first call at 10:05 on this bill, you recognize that number?

A Do I — well, I don't recognize it, no. I know what it is, but —

Q What is it?

A That's — it's the phone number to the limousine.

Q Okay, the car — the phone that you had in your car?

A Yes.

Q All right. And does that reflect a call that came in to you at 10:05?

A Yes.

Q Who would that be from?

---
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A That would be from Dale St. John.
Q Your boss?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you see then a call at 10:43:44 on June 12?
A Yes, I do.
Q And do you recognize the phone number to which the call was placed?
A Yes, I do.
Q Whose phone number is that?
A That is Dale St. John’s business line.
Q Okay. And when you say business line, you earlier indicated to us that you placed a phone call to his pager (ポケッットベル)?
A Yes.
Q Is that the same as his business line?
A Yes, it is.
Q Okay. Now, directing your attention — okay, all right, after you placed the call to Dale St. John’s pager, what did you do next?
A I made the call and I left the number that — to call me back and after that I got back out of the car and proceeded to ring the intercom a few more times.
Q Okay. Let me ask you something, Mr. Park. When you say you left a number for him to call you back, what number did you leave, the number to what?
A Actually, I think I left like 911 because I never knew the phone number to the limousine. I never knew what — never knew what the number to the limousine phone was, so I couldn’t leave him a number.

I didn’t know, so I just left him 911 figuring (思って）he’d
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figure it out (了解する), realize I was in some kind of trouble.

Q And what kind of trouble were you in that you left the 911?
A That nobody was answering, that I didn’t think anybody was home, so I wanted to find out what his instructions were from there to figure out what to do.

Q All right. And that was at 10:43 was it pm?
A Yes, it was.

Q At the time that you were ringing the bell, sir, can you tell us whether you could see any lights on in the house?
A There was one light on upstairs.

Q Could you see any lights on downstairs?
A No, I couldn’t.

Q How did it appear downstairs in the house?
A It appeared to be no lights on.

Q After you called your boss at home and got no answer, what did you do next?
A Um, I stepped back out of the car and proceeded to ring the buzzer some more times, still got no answer.

Q Okay. How many more times did you ring the buzzer at that point, sir?
A I don’t know, two or three.

Q Two or three times?
A Yeah.

Q All right. When you rang the buzzer again a couple more times and got no answer, what happened next?
A The next thing I remembered was hearing the car phone ring inside the car and got back in and picked up the phone and it
was Dale St. John.

Q  Okay now, do you see in the phone bill in front of you, sir, a call at 10:52 and 17 seconds?

A  Yes, I do.

(省略)

Q  (By Ms. Clark, continuing) All right. Now, as you were seated in the limousine, speaking to your boss, did you say something to your boss?

A  Yeah, I told him that I thought nobody was home.

Q  And then what happened? Did he respond to you?

A  Yes, he —

Q  Did he tell you to do something?

A  Well, he asked me to —

Q  Okay. What did your boss tell you?

A  Well, first he told me, he said, he said O.J.'s usually running a little late, so hang out until about 11:15. If he is not there by then, go ahead and come on home.

Q  Okay.

A  He also asked because I told him there was no lights on downstairs, he asked me to look at the pantry area, what he called a pantry area, where there was what resembled some sunroofs or skylighting toward the garage area and he asked me if there was any lights on in there.

Q  Okay.

A  He said he usually watches T.V. in there.

Q  Now, can you locate the area that he was directing you to look at on this diagram.

A  Just straight down from the circle right in that area on the roof, I'm pretty sure. It is hard to tell with this kind of a drawing.
Q  Okay. You think that was the area?
A  It would have been somewhere around there.
Q  All right. And did you do what he asked you to do? Did you look?
A  Yes.
Q  And did you see any lights on in that area?
A  No, I didn't.
Q  And did you tell him so?
A  Yes, I did.
Q  Now, the — you see the area designated as play yard?
A  Yes.
Q  That area, was that — were you able to see it, how is it lit?
A  It is very dark.
Q  At some point during your phone conversation with Dale St. John, did something attract your attention?
A  Yes, a white male walked from behind the house area on a pathway and he had a flashlight on his hand and he stopped, he stopped before he got to the driveway.
Q  Okay.
A  So I — I told Dale that, you know, somebody is home.
Q  All right. Now, at that particular point in time, had you already looked at the — at the house, the area that you were directed to look at by Dale St. John to see if there were any lights?
A  Yes.
Q  And after you saw that there were no lights, was it after that point that you saw this white male?
A  Yes, it was.
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Q And that person that you are describing, have you since learned what his name is?
A Yes.
Q And with an is his name?
A Kato.
Q Can you show us on the diagram, direct the pointer to where you saw him on the side yard?
A Right there where the arrow was where the path — where the path comes out from behind the house, he came out to just about the driveway, right there.
Q Was he on the driveway or was he on the grass?
A No, he was off a couple feet.
Q Okay. Tell the pointer where to go.
A Just right there.
Q Okay. Was he on the grass or on the path?
A I couldn’t see.
Q You couldn’t tell?
A No.
Q So is that the general location (大体の位置) where he was?
A Yes.
Q Could you tell what kind of flashlight he had?
A At that time, no.

THE COURT: We need to take a break (休憩) at this point. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we’re going to take a 10-minute break for the court reporter and for a comfort recess (トイレ休憩).

And we’ll resume (再開する) with the rereading in about 10 minutes. Okay. Let’s take a break.

(2:20 PST)
(Jury exits.)

(Recess (休憩) taken.)

**XI. 事件当日のシンプソンの行動**

事件当日の Simpson のアリバイについて検察と弁護側の主張はまったく異なっている。それぞれどのように主張しているのであろうか。新聞 USA Today がインターネット上にまとめている情報でその違いを調べてみよう。どちらの情報も法廷内にて主張された証言にもとづいてまとめたものである。

Timelines presented by both sides in the O.J. Simpson case

Timelines outlined by each side in the O.J. Simpson murder case, based on testimony presented at trial. The prosecution tried to support its theory that the murders happened about 10:15 pm; the defense tried to push the murder time later, arguing that Simpson didn't have time to kill and then catch a plane.

All times are PDT for the night of June 12, 1994, and the following morning.

**THE DEFENSE**

* About 8 pm – Danny Mandel arrives at Ellen Aaronson’s apartment in Brentwood for a blind date.
* 8:30 pm – The walk a few blocks to the Mezzaluna restaurant.
* 9:50 pm – Waitress asks them to close out bill so she can end shift.
* 10:15 or 10:20 – They leave Mezzaluna and begin stroll back (歩いて戻る) to
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Aaronson’s apartment.
* 10:20 pm – Francesca Harman drives by Nicole Brown Simpson’s home on way home from dinner party in area; area very still, no dogs barking.
* 10:21 pm – Neighbor Denise Pilnak sees friend off, describes neighborhood as absolutely still（静かな）.
* 10:25 pm – Mandel and Aaronson pass by Ms. Simpson’s condominium and see nothing amiss, hear no dogs barking.
* 10:35 pm – Mandel and Aaronson arrive at Aaronson’s apartment.
* 10:35 pm – Pilnak hears dog barking, continues for about 45 minutes.
* About 11 pm – Mandel leaves Aaronson’s apartment.
* 5:34 am – James Merrill picks Simpson up at Chicago airport.
* 8:25 am – An agitated（動揺した）Simpson calls Merrill, needing ride from hotel to airport.
* About 8:45 am – Raymond Kilduff takes Simpson back to airport, says his left hand is bleeding.

THE PROSECUTION

* 6 pm – Ms. Simpson and Simpson leave separately from daughter Sydney’s dance recital, where Simpson sat apart from his ex-wife and her family.
* 6:30 pm – Ms. Simpson dines with family and friends at Mez-
zaluna restaurant, where Ronald Goldman was working as waiter.

* 8:30 or 8:45 pm – Brown family leaves Mezzaluna. Ms. Simpson takes children for ice cream.

* 9:10 pm – Simpson and his houseguest Brian “Kato” Kaelin leave for s in Simpson’s Bentley.

* 9:37 pm – A couple of minutes after returning, Kaelin goes to his room; last sees Simpson standing at the door of the car.

* 9:37 pm – Ms. Simpson’s mother, Juditha Brown, calls restaurant to ask about her glasses she left behind. A few minutes later she calls her daughter.

* 9:47 pm or before – Ms. Simpson calls, asking to talk to Goldman.

* 9:50 pm – Goldman leaves restaurant.

* 10:15 pm – Neighbors Pablo Fenjves and Eva Stein say a dog’s wail (悲哀な悲鳴) is heard throughout Ms. Simpson’s neighborhood, a sign prosecutors say points to the time of the murders.

* 10:22 pm – Limousine driver Allan Park arrives early at Simpson estate two miles from crime scene. He doesn’t see Simpson’s Bronco when watching the curb for street numbers.

* 10:40 pm – Park gets out of limo, buzzes intercom couple of times, fails to get answer.

* About 10:45 pm – While talking on the phone, Kaelin hears three thumps on wall, goes outside to investigate.

* 10:55 pm – Park sees a large, shadowy figure at the front door of Simpson’s estate and Kaelin approaching from the pathway. Moments later, Simpson answers the intercom.

* 10:55 pm – Ms. Simpson’s neighbor Steven Schwab finds agi-
tated Akita a few blocks away from her home.

* About 11:01 pm – Simpson comes out of his house to meet limousine driver.

* About 11:15 pm – Limo leaves for airport.

* About midnight June 13 – Akita leads neighbors to murder scene.

**XII. 評決朗読**

評決は全員一致で無罪であった。法廷では評決はどのようにして朗読されるのであろうか。10月3日の速記録を読むことによってそのときの様子を探ってみる。前日の2日に評決一致に至ったのにもかかわらず、その朗読は被告人在廷の必要性からか、一日延期され、翌3日の10時に朗読された。法廷内における朗読前後の手続きの展開も興味あるところである。資料はウエストロー・データベースの非公式記録から入手したものである。

**O.J. SIMPSON FOUND NOT GUILTY!**

10/03/95 O.J. Unofficial Transcript 10:24 am–10:44 am (Pacific)

《The following unofficial transcript is not provided or approved by the Superior Court, Los Angeles County.》

《The time displayed above reflects receipt at West Publishing, Pacific Time.》

**CALIFORNIA, PLAINTIFF V. ORENTHAL JAMES SIMPSON, DEFENDANT.**

**TOPIC:** UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

**DOCKET–NUMBER:** BA097211

**VENUE:** SUPERIOR COURT, LOS ANGELES COUNTY
TEXT (本文):
(10:00 PST)
THE COURT: All right. Back on the record in the Simpson matter. Mr. Simpson is again present before the Court with his counsel, Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Kardashian, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Blasier. People represented by Ms. Clark, Mr. Darden and Mr. Hodgman. The jury is not present. Good morning, Counsel. All right. The record should reflect (と記録して下さい) that earlier this morning at 9:00 the Court met informally with counsel here in the courtroom because there are too many lawyers to go into chambers this morning for the purposes of discussing notifications (通知) to the jurors regarding their rights of privacy and the interest of the news media to interview them or speak to them following the delivery (引き渡し) of the verdict (評決) in Court here today.
The Court distributed to the parties (検察・弁護側双方) copies of the questionnaire that has been distributed (配布する) to the jurors. And also the notice (注意) to them regarding confidentiality (秘密保持) under 237 of the code of civil procedure (民事訴訟法).
And those two questionnaires have been returned by the jurors. They have uniformly (全員一様に) indicated their desire that their public — excuse me, their private information remain confidential.
They have also indicated to the Court unanimously (全員一致で) a desire not to speak to the attorneys after the conclusion of the trial and not to speak with the news media, either.
All right. Counsel, is there anything else we need to take up before I
invite the jurors to join us?
Deputy Terrara, let's have the jurors, please.

(10:02 PST)

(Jury enters.)

(10:03 PST)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, please be seated. And the record should reflect that we have now been rejoined by all the members of our jury panel and our alternates.

Good morning again, ladies and gentlemen.

THE JURY: Good morning.

THE COURT: Mrs. Robertson, would you — do you have the envelope with the sealed verdict forms, please.

THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you give those to Deputy Terrara. And would you return those to our foreperson, Juror Number 1. All right. Madam Foreperson, would you please open the envelope and check the condition of the verdict forms.

Madam Foreperson, you've had the opportunity to review the verdict forms?

MADAM FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Are they the same forms you signed and are they in order?

MADAM FOREPERSON: Yes, they are.

THE COURT: Would you hand those, please, to Deputy Terrara. And you have signed and dated those verdict forms indicating the jury's verdict?

MADAM FOREPERSON: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm going to ask that you carefully listen to the verdicts as
they are being read by the clerk, Mrs. Robertson, as after the verdicts have been read, you will be asked if these are your verdicts.

And I would caution the audience during the course of the readings of these verdicts to remain calm and that any — if there is any disruption during the reading of the verdicts, the bailiffs will have the obligation to remove any persons disrupting these proceedings.

Mrs. Robertson. Mr. Simpson, would you please stand and face the jury.

Mrs. Robertson.

THE CLERK: Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, in the matter of the People of the State of California versus Orenthal James Simpson, case number BA097211.

We the jury in the above-entitled action find the defendant, Orenthal James Simpson, not guilty of the crime of murder in violation of Penal Code Section 187A, a felony, upon Nicole Brown Simpson, a human being, as charged in Count I of the information.

Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, in the People of the State of California versus Orenthal James Simpson.

We the jury, in the above-entitled action, find the defendant, Orenthal James Simpson, not guilty of the crime of murder in violation of Penal Code Section 187A, a felony, upon Ronald Lyle Goldman, a human being, as charged in Count II, of the information.

We the jury, in the above-entitled action, further find the special circumstance that the defendant, Orenthal James Simpson, has in this case been convicted of at least one crime of murder of the first degree and one or more crimes of murder of the first or second degree to be not true.
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Signed this second day of October 1995, Juror 230.
Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this your verdict, so say you one, so say you all? (各自そうおっしゃいますか、みなさん全員がそおっしゃいますか)
THE JURY: Yes.
(10:10 PST).
THE COURT: All right. Counsel, Mr. Simpson, would you be seated, please. Let's have it quiet in the courtroom, please.
All right. Mrs. Robertson, would you please poll (ひとりずつ認否を問う) the jurors?
THE CLERK: Juror number 1, as to (に関して) Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 1: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 2, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 2: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 3, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 3: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 4, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 4: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 5, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 5: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 6, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 6: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 7, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 7: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 8, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 8: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 9, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 9: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 10, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 10: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 11, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 11: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 12, as to Count 1, is this your verdict?
JUROR 12: Yes.
THE CLERK: Okay. Count 2. Juror number 1, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 1: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 2, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 2: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 3, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 3: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 4, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 4: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 5, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 5: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 6, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 6: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 7, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 7: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 8, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 8: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 9, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 9: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 10, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 10: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 11, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 11: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number 12, as to Count 2, is this your verdict?
JUROR 12: Yes.
THE COURT: The clerk is directed to record the verdicts as read. The parties agree to waive reading of the verdicts as recorded. Mr. Cochran, do you waive reading of the verdict as recorded?
MR. COCHRAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Ms. Clark?
MS. CLARK: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to at this time take this opportunity to publicly thank you for the service that you've given to us. The burdens that we placed upon you were enormous. And I, in words, can't begin to express the debt that we owe to you for the time, the patience, and the endurance that you've given to us during the course of this case.
I will have an opportunity to meet with you privately later, and I'll give you my private comments when we have a chance to meet.
I want to caution you at this time that there is, as you know, intense media interest in this case. The news media will probably seek you out at your home or at your place of business. And I would employ that the news media act responsibly to avoid harassing you or identifying you without your consent or otherwise causing you concern. Whether you wish to cooperate with the news media is, of course, entirely up to you. However, I must warn you to expect the worst as far as that is concerned.
We want to — I know I share with you in expressing our thanks to the bailiffs from the sheriff's department; to our court reporters, Ms. Moxham and Ms. Olson; to the research attorney, John Burn, who's assisted us; our Pepperdine clerks, Ms. Golive and
Ms. Carswell (phonetic); Jerriane Hayslett and her staff; and, of course, the jury commissioner (陪審員担当官) Gloria Gomez and her staff.

All right. Counsel, is there anything we need to take up before we excuse the jurors? Mr. Cochran.

MR. COCHRAN: May we approach for just one second one last time? (10:12 PST)

(Sidebar discussion (裁判官席側での裁判官、検察、弁護士3者の話し合い))

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I am now going to excuse you from further service on this case. As you know, this does absolve you from your vows of silence (沈黙の誓い、守秘義務). You may take with you your juror notebooks, as you have requested. And we'll be chatting with you shortly. All right. Thank you very much, and I'll see you all later. All right.

(10:14 PST).

THE COURT: Everybody have a seat, please.

All right. Ms. Clark, Mr. Cochran, anything else we need to take up?

MR. COCHRAN: No, Your Honor. We'd like to thank the Court. Thank you very, very kindly.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. The defendant, having been acquitted (無罪とする) of both charges (容疑), he is ordered transported (護送する) to an appropriate sheriff's facility (保安官施設) and released (釈放する) forthwith (即刻).

All right. We'll stand in recess (休廷する).

MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Proceedings adjourned)
XIII. 解任させられた陪審員たちの解任理由

今回の裁判は異常と言われたほど次々と陪審員が辞めさせられていった。最終的に補充要員（alternatives）は２人だけになってしまった。mistrial（審理無効）になるのではないかと危惧されたほどである。彼らが辞めさせられた理由は何であったのであろうか。公表されている範囲でその解任理由を紹介し、陪審員が辞めさせられる理由について調べてみる。資料は同じく CNN インターネット文字情報である。

The reasons why nine people have been removed (解任する) as jurors in this case:

1. Conflict of interest (利害対立) : possibility of bias (偏見の可能性) : because one worked for HERTZ (who also employed OJ Simpson as a spokesperson for the company)

2. Possibility of bias : on the basis that OJ Simpson and the juror both received medical services (治療) from the same physician (医師)

3. Vested interest (既得の利権) : one allegedly (申し立てによると) bet (賭けをする) on the outcome of the trial, on the verdict.

4. Possibility of bias : two jurors have allegedly been in abusive relationships (罵倒する関係) themselves

5. Disregard of jury instructions (陪審員に対する指示無視) : one was found to have been keeping notes in his room, and there was concern (懸念) that he's writing a book about the trial, the jury, etc.,
and therefore had a vested interest in serving on the jury.

6. Said that she “just couldn’t take it anymore (これ以上耐えられな
   い).”


8. Intimidating personality (脅迫的性质).

9. Passed a note (メモを渡した) to a dismissed (解任された) juror.

XIV. 無罪評決を下した最終陪審員団の構成メンバー

最後まで残って無罪評決を出した陪審員たちはどのような人たちであっ
たのか。資料は CNN の文字情報からである。

The Jury (陪審員12名)

黒人女性8名
1. 50 yrs old, divorced, a vendor (売り人), lives in South–Central
   Los Angeles
2. 37 yrs old, married, a postal worker; is a high school graduate
3. 44 yrs old, single, a computer technician
4. 38 yrs old, single, an environmental–health specialist
5. 52 yrs old, divorced, a clerk and a high–school graduate
6. 71 yrs old, married, a retired office cleaner
7. 28 yrs old, married, a postal worker
8. 24 yrs old, single, a hospital employee (病院従業員)

白人女性2名
1. 60 yrs old, divorced, a retired gas–company employee
2. 22 yrs old, single, an insurance–claims adjuster (保険査定人)

黒人男性1名
1. 43 yrs old, married, a marketing representative (販売外交員)

スペイン系男性1名
1. 32 yrs old, married, a truckdriver; lives in East L.A.

残留補充陪審員2名
The (remaining) two alternatives to the jury panel are as follows:

One white woman: 24 yrs old, married, a fire–department receptionist (消防署受付係)
One black man: 72 yrs old, married, a retired security guard (退職警備員)

XV. 無罪と評決した合理的疑いの要点

評決は無罪であった。陪審員たちはどのような理由や証拠にもとづいて無罪としたのであろうか。検察側はその合理的疑いを否定できなければ有罪にはできない。弁護側によって効果的に提出された合理的疑いの要点とは何か。資料は新聞 USA Today がまとめたインターネット情報である。

Points of reasonable doubt raised by defense

When jurors acquitted (無罪とする) O.J. Simpson of murder, they cited reasonable doubt about the evidence. The points of doubt raised most effectively by the defense are:

The time line:
The prosecution's minute by minute effort to reconstruct the killings of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman was designed to give Simpson enough time to commit the murders, return home, dispose of bloody clothes and a weapon, clean blood off his body and appear spotless and composed when a limousine driver met him. But the time line provided only six minutes, from 10:55 pm when a shadowy figure was seen entering the house to 11:01 pm when Simpson emerged perfectly groomed. Jurors thought that was impossible.

The vial of blood:

Simpson's blood sample was drawn at the Los Angeles Police Department on June 13, 1994, the morning after the killings, but was not immediately booked into evidence by Detective Philip Vannatter. Vannatter had put it in his pocket and took it to Simpson's estate where criminalists were collecting evidence. Jurors questioned why he would have carried it around for hours instead of booking it. The defense suggested evidence planting.

The socks:

A pair of socks found on a rug next to Simpson's bed were collected by a criminalist who said he picked them up because they seemed "out of place." But no one noticed any blood on them until two months later when they were being examined at the crime lab. Defense experts said the blood may have been smeared on them when they were lying flat, not when a person was wearing them.
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The glove:

The most infamous piece of evidence in the Simpson trial was the glove found on a leafy pathway behind a guest house at Simpson’s estate (邸宅). Witnesses including Detective Mark Fuhrman said it was sticky (ねばついた) with blood when they saw it some seven hours after the killings. Testimony suggested the blood would have been dry by then. Although the glove was analyzed as having large amounts of blood and trace (痕跡) evidence on its surface, the leafy area around it was pristine (自然の状態のまま). Jurors asked why there were no blood drops on the pathway.

The bronco:

Although scientific analysis uncovered (発見する) traces of blood in Simpson’s vehicle, the amounts were small and most were not immediately detected. Some witnesses claimed they saw no blood at the outset (始め), and photographs provided conflicting (矛盾する) evidence of when blood was found on various parts of the vehicle.

The absence of blood in Simpson’s house:

Although prosecutors claim he arrived home after walking through blood and dirt, there were no traces of blood or soil on the light colored carpet in Simpson’s house.

Mark Fuhrman’s testimony:

The since—retired police detective found much of the key evidence in-
cluding the glove and the first Bronco stains. But his decimation (処刑) by the defense as a racist and liar threw all of his testimony into doubt.

Simpson’s appearance and demeanor (行状):

Witnesses said that Simpson was fashionably attired (盛装して) and immaculate (清潔な) when he boarded a plane for Chicago, appearing as natty as an advertisement for men’s clothing. His attitude was cheerful and he signed autographs (サイン) for fans. When he returned the next day, after receiving news of his ex-wife’s slaying, he was distressed (悲しんでいる).

XVI. 公判全過程

最後に、9ヶ月にわたって行われた裁判はどのような過程を経て展開していったのか公判全過程を振り返ってみる。裁判の非公式記録はこの裁判のように特に注目される裁判の場合はインターネットでも無料で入手可能である。法廷で検察、弁護側各方はどのような論戦を展開していったのであろうか。毎日の裁判の内容のうちもっとも重要と思われる点のみをあげながら、その中に含まれる法律関係の英語を拾ってみる。

公判は1995年1月13日に開始され、10月3日の評決発表まで、9ヶ月。実際に陪審員選任を開始してからでは372日、1年と7日かかった。資料はおなじく CNN 文字情報である。

January Transcripts (1月公判記録)

January 13, 1995 (1月)

In a hearing (聴取) to determine (決定する) if evidence challenging Fuhrman's credibility (信頼性) will be admitted (認められるか否か) at trial (公判), prosecutors (検察側) said they believe Simpson
dropped the glove himself as he attempted to sneak back (こっそり戻ってくる) to his mansion the night of the murder (殺害).

January 16, 1995 —
Simpson defense attorneys F. Lee Bailey and Robert Shapiro are not speaking to one another just before Simpson’s murder trial begins.

January 17, 1995 —
Prosecutors withdrew (取り下げる) their request (請求) to see the medical records (診察記録) of OJ Simpson’s oldest children, Arnelle and Jason.

January 18, 1995 —
Judge Lance Ito ruled (裁可する) that members of the families of Nicole Simpson and Ronald Goldman can be present during most of the Simpson murder trial.
Judge Lance Ito issued an order (命令) limiting O.J. Simpson’s jail visitation privilege (面会特権).

January 19, 1995 —
In a major blow (強力な打撃) to the defense (弁護側), Judge Lance Ito has ruled that many of the allegations (申し立て) of domestic violence (家庭内暴力) may be admitted during the trial, including potentially damaging (有力な損害を与えない) 911 calls (日本の110番) made by his ex-wife.

January 20, 1995 —
Attorneys in the Simpson case will argue (反論する) what, if anything, can be said about Det. (刑事 detective の略字) Mark Fuhrman in
opening statements (冒頭陳述).

January 23, 1995 —
The first order of business for Judge Lance Ito was postponing a hearing on whether to quash the subpoena of O.J. Simpson’s first wife.
Ito also ruled that the prosecution can introduce graphic photographs of victim Nicole Simpson and Ronald Goldman taken at the crime scene. Only the jury will be allowed to see them.

January 24, 1995 —
Opening statements in the Simpson case got under way with prosecutor Christopher Darden telling the jury they would find out why Simpson killed his ex-wife and her friend.

January 25, 1995 —
Opening statements are under way by the defense in the Simpson case. Defense attorney Johnnie Cochran said Simpson is an innocent man wrongly accused. Statements were delayed after the court camera accidentally captured an alternative.

January 26, 1995 —
A defense witness list caused delays in the Simpson trial.

January 27, 1995 —
The O.J. Simpson defense team revealed the names of several new potential witnesses in court documents; saying they had information that could potentially exonerate Simpson.
January 30, 1995 —
Defense attorney Johnnie Cochran said that evidence collected by police in the sensational double murder case was “contaminated (不純な), compromised (妥協した) and ultimately corrupted (腐敗した).”

January 31, 1995 —
The first witness, 911 operator (交換手), took the stand (証人席につく) Tuesday in the Simpson trial. A detective testified (証言する) that when he responded to a 911 call in 1989, Nicole Simpson ran toward him wearing only a bra and sweatshirt yelling (叫ぶ) “he’s going to kill me, he’s going to kill me.”

February Transcripts (2月)

February 1, 1995 —
The prosecution called a former LAPD officer (警察官) and a friend of OJ Simpson’s to the stand.

February 2, 1995 —
Former LAPD officer attempted again to fight off (退ける) defense allegations (弁護側陳述) he is a liar with a drinking problem who sought to (しようとする) further (助長する) his acting career.

February 3, 1995 —
One of Nicole Brown Simpson’s neighbors testified that OJ was upset because someone was having sex with “his wife.”

February 6, 1995 —
Denise Brown, older sister of Nicole Brown, completes her emotional testimony.
February 7, 1995 —
Marcia Clark’s team presents the evidence to establish the time the murders were committed.

February 8, 1995 —
A neighbor testified that he found Nicole’s dog roaming the neighborhood the night of the murders. Its paws and chest covered with blood.

February 9, 1995 —
LAPD officer, Robert Riske, presents his testimony. Riske was the first officer on the scene.

February 14, 1995 —
The defense used photographs before and after the bodies were removed from the murder scene in an attempt to show that evidence, such as the bloody glove and envelope, was moved and tampered with.

February 15, 1995 —
The defense continued to hammer away at their contention the initial investigation of the double murder crime scene was sloppy and incomplete. For the first time, the prosecution disclosed that blood found on the rear at Nicole’s condo on Bundy matches OJ’s blood.

February 16, 1995 —
A key defense witness, Rosa Lopez, has left the country and has gone.
home to El Salvador.

February 17, 1995 —
Det. Ronald Phillips testified it was Fuhrman who saw a spot (血痕) on the Bronco parked outside the gate, Fuhrman who climbed over the wall, and Fuhrman who found the bloody glove.

February 20, 1995 —
Experts at an Albany, N.Y., hospital retained (雇う) by the defense team are working to sift through (鑑定する) evidence from the trial.

February 21, 1995 —
Det. Tom Lange, the lead detective (主任刑事) in the Simpson investigation, testified that after a bloody glove was found at Simpson’s mansion he returned to the murder scene to determine if it matched one found near the bodies.

February 22, 1995 —
Det. Tom Lange testified that Nicole was apparently attacked (襲う) before Goldman, and Goldman put up a fight (争う) for his life.

February 23, 1995 —
Judge Ito and Deputy DA (DA は地区検事長, Deputy DA は検事補) Darden have a heated conversation (激論) in the courtroom.

February 24, 1995 —
The jury saw a videotape at the crime scene the morning after the double murder. The defense is attempting to prove the crime scene was mishandled and evidence was contaminated (汚染する). A tran-
script of a sidebar conversation reveals that the defense says it's up to Simpson （シンプソン次第である） if his daughter will ever be called to testify.

February 27, 1995 —
Attorneys for Simpson have filed a motion （申し立てを行う） seeking personnel records of LAPD Detective Mark Fuhrman.

February 28, 1995 —
Attorneys from both sides are involved in a dispute about the credibility （信頼性） of witness Rosa Lopez's testimony. Judge Ito is forced to stall （中止する） the trial to deal with the situation.

March Transcripts （3月）

March 1, 1995 —
Ito removed （解任する） a black male from the panel （陪審員団） and replaced him with a white female.

March 2, 1995 —
Judge Ito is considering what punishments to impose on the defense for not turning over a tape of key defense witness Rosa Lopez's first interview to a defense investigator.

Defense attorney Gerald Uelman admitted to Ito, “We screwed up （大失敗する）. We admit it and we apologize for it,” he said, “the only explanation is that we are human. We do not admit to ignorance of the law （法の不知） or contempt for court orders （法制侮辱罪）.” Rosa Lopez, a house keeper who lived next door to Simpson and insisted she saw his Bronco parked outside his house at about the time prosecutors say Simpson was killing ex-wife and her friend, admits she is—
n't exactly sure what time she saw it parked there.

March 3, 1995 —
Lopez, who may give Simpson an alibi for the time his ex-wife was killed, admitted she was not walking her employer's dog in an area where it would be easy to see Simpson's Bronco. Lopez may be in hot water (やっかいなことになる) over lying about her age.

Transcripts from a sidebar conference reveal that Lopez's driver's license has a birthdate seven years different from the date on her application for unemployment compensation.

March 6, 1995 —
The defense is trying to show that police, in their "rush to judgment (即断)" , had Simpson pegged (決め込む) as the murderer of his ex-wife and her friend from the start of their investigation.

Lead investigator Det. Tom Lange said he and other detectives never pursued any leads (手がかり) that would suggest someone other than Simpson committed the murders.

March 7, 1995 —
LAPD Detective Tom Lange remains on the stand for cross-examination (反対尋問) by the defense.

March 8, 1995 —
Judge Ito is taking under consideration defense motions to quash (無効にする) the subpoenas (召喚状) of Simpson's personal assistant and his former maid. He said he will issue a written ruling (書面による決定). Ito ruled that Simpson's lawyers can see some confidential personnel information on LAPD Det. Fuhrman.
The defense suggested he is a racist who may have planted (置く) it there in an effort to frame (隠れる) Simpson.

March 9, 1995 —
The lead investigator said he estimated the victims died sometime between 9 pm and midnight, and doubts a narrower estimate could have been made if the coroner (検死官) had been called sooner. The coroner did not examine the bodies on Nicole and Goldman until about 10 hours after their bodies were found.

March 10, 1995 —
Det. Fuhrman said he was never alone at the murder scene until after other policemen had shown him evidence, including a glove and a cap. Under repeated questioning from Simpson defense attorney F. Lee Bailey, Fuhrman denied meeting a woman named Kathleen Bell. He also denied meeting Bell and her friend Andrea Terry “in a bar”, and he denied making racist statements (人種差別発言) to either of them at any time.

March 14, 1995 —
Famed defense attorney F. Lee Bailey began his cross-examination of Det. Fuhrman after telling the court he would prove Fuhrman planted a bloody glove at the home of Simpson.

March 15, 1995 —
Simpson attorney F. Lee Bailey and Lead Prosecutor Marcia Clark openly dispute (反論する) allegations (申し立て) made by the defense that Detective Mark Fuhrman used racial slurs (人種差別用語) against a Marine sergeant.
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March 16, 1995 —
Judge Ito has ordered the attorneys to stop engaging in "gratuitous (われわれのない), personal attacks upon each other" in the courtroom. Asst. Chief of Investigations Juan Jiminez claims that LAPD detectives were lax (怠慢な) in notifying the coroner of the bodies of Nicole and Goldman.

March 17, 1995 —
Det. Vannatter said he considered Simpson a "strong suspect (有力な容疑者)" the morning after the double murders after he saw a blood trail (血の跡) on Simpson's driveway that lead into his house, blood inside his Bronco, and a bloody glove in his yard. Another juror has been excused (放免する) from the case, but no cause was given.

March 20, 1995 —
Jurors showed great interest in getting a close-up view of Simpson's hand. Simpson actually put his hand inside the jury box and jurors leaned forward to examine the knuckle.

March 21, 1995 —
Shapiro is trying to shake Det. Vannatter's credibility by asking about inconsistencies (矛盾) and mistakes on the affidavit (宣誓供述書) for the warrant (令状). Defense attorneys say the mystery knife in the envelope was taken from Simpson's house after police failed to find it during two separate searches.

March 22, 1995 —
A war of words has broken out between a defense attorney and LA police chief Willie Williams. Williams called Alan Dershowitz a liar.
and demanded an apology (謝罪を要求する) on behalf of (ために) Los Angeles police officers.

March 23, 1995 —
Kato Kaelin said he did not see Simpson from 9:35 pm until nearly 11 pm the night of the murders, and he did not know his whereabouts (所在) during that time. The defense contends (主張する) he was taking a nap (仮眠). The prosecution says he was killing Nicole and Goldman.

March 27, 1995 —
Prosecutors say they may call Olympic champion Bruce Jenner to testify about a Christmas party where Simpson and Nicole argued (口論する) over one of her old boyfriends.

March 28, 1995 —
Sidebar transcripts reveal the prosecution has a witness who observed Simpson on his cell phone the afternoon of June 12 acting upset and angry. The limo driver told prosecutors that he did not see Simpson's white Bronco parked on the street when he arrived at 10:22 pm. Prosecutors have cellular telephone records showing Simpson made a call to Nicole the afternoon before the killings.

March 29, 1995 —
Judge Ito rules on the admissibility (許容性) of the cell phone records the prosecution obtained.

March 30, 1995 —
The prosecution used two witnesses, luggage and photographs in an
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attempt to show Simpson could have left a bag full of bloody clothes at the airport. Prosecutors say a witness has come forward who will say he, too, saw Simpson placed a duffel bag (雑囊) on top of a trash can (ごみ入れ) at Los Angeles International Airport.

March 31, 1995 —
A neighbor testified he did not see Simpson’s white Ford Bronco outside his front gates between 9:30 and 9:45.

April Transcripts (4月)

April 3, 1995 —
The trial is now concentrating on the collection and testing of evidence. Both sides are preparing to battle over the testimony of medical examiner (検死官, 検死医) Dr. Irwin Golden.

April 4, 1995 —
The jury was shown a series of photos showing blood stains (血痕) and smears (染み) that covered the inside of Simpson’s Bronco.

April 5, 1995 —
Dennis Fung testified he did not find any red stains on the narrow walk near where a bloody glove was found at Simpson’s mansion. Another juror has been removed from the jury.

April 6, 1995 —
Two jurors were sick and Judge Ito called them “no-go mads (ダメな奥様たち).” He said rather than replace (入れ替える) them with two people from the dwindling pool of alternatives (少なくなった補充陪審員団), he’d hear motions out of their presence (彼らのいないところ) (103) — 78
and hope they'd return Friday.
A video tape which shows a glove at the murder scene can be introduced as evidence, Judge Ito ruled.

April 7, 1995 —
The court released a motion filed by an attorney for Robert Kardashian seeking to exclude his testimony (証言させない）from the trial by stating he is an active attorney (活動中の弁護士) working for Simpson' defense. The court also released an update (最新情報) on the condition of the three ill jurors.

April 11, 1995 —
Attorney Barry Scheck asked that the jurors look at the envelope from the crime scene that contained Juditha Brown's glasses. Criminalist (犯罪学者) Dennis Fung stood firm during his third day of cross-examination, insisting to Barry Scheck that he did not know evidence was moved at the crime scene.

April 12, 1995 —
The defense continued its attack on a criminalist, dissecting (分析する) key evidence (重要証拠) and once again implying evidence was planted in an effort to frame Simpson.

April 13, 1995 —
Excused juror Jeanette Harris denied to Judge Ito that she ever discussed the case with other jurors while she sat on the panel.

April 14, 1995 —
Prosecutors asked Dennis Fung a series of questions intended to show
that he followed standard procedures during his investigation. Barry Scheck spent most of the day trying to punch holes in the credibility of Dennis Fung.

April 17, 1995 —
Prosecution shows new evidence to rehabilitate Fung.

April 18, 1995 —
Dennis Fung spent most of Monday shooting down theories Simpson’s defense team built up last week. Scheck on attack again during Fung’s ninth day on the stand.

April 19, 1995 —
Criminalist Dennis Fung left the stand after nine days of testimony and shook the hand of Simpson and members of his defense team. Prosecutors filed a motion asking for “parity in sanctions” against the defense.

April 20, 1995 —
Prosecution brings Andrea Mazzola to the stand. Mazzola worked with Fung in collecting evidence at the murder scene.

April 24, 1995 —
The murder case against American football legend O.J. Simpson has cost Los Angeles County $4,201,191 through March 31. Testimony remained on hold while Judge Ito met with jurors to discuss sequestration problems.
April 25, 1995 —
Johnnie Cochran submits a complaint (告訴状) to Judge Ito about Commander Holland of the Sheriff’s Dept (執行官局司令官), meeting with the District Attorneys outside of the courtroom. The defense also debates if Andrea Mazzola could be considered an expert witness (鑑定).

April 26, 1995 —
An alternate juror became the focus of concern (関心の的) of Judge Ito and Johnnie Cochran. Criminalist Andrea Mazzola took the stand for the fourth day and attempted to repair any damage done to her credibility by defense attorney Peter Neufeld.

May Transcripts (5月)

May 1, 1995 —
A police chemist (鑑識官) testified he would not expect criminalists to collect every blooddrop in a trail. The defense team said that prosecutors should not be allowed to say blood found at the crime scene is “consistent with (一致する)” Simpson’s until they introduce evidence showing how a test sample taken from Simpson was collected and packaged. Another juror has been excused, the seventh so far.

May 2, 1995 —
A police chemist, on the stand for a second day, testified that blood found on a sock, recovered from Simpson’s bedroom, was “consistent with the type we found for item number 59, Nicole Brown.”

May 3, 1995 —
Police forensic chemist (法廷鑑識官) Greg Matheson returned to the
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stand for a third day.

May 4, 1995 —
The blood Simpson gave investigators and the blood found under the fingernails of ex-wife he is accused of murdering came under the magnifying glass (拡大鏡).

May 5, 1995 —
Prosecutors told Judge Ito that their "reading" of an FBI report on blood evidence found at the crime scenes indicates it could not have come from a sample of Simpson's blood.

May 8, 1995 —
The prosecution called Robin Cotton, DNA expert and lab director (科学捜査研究所長, 鑑識所長) at Cellmark Laboratories, which performed the bulk of the DNA tests that were conducted on the blood, fiber and hair samples in the case.

May 9, 1995 —
Robin Cotton, spent a second day on the stand explaining DNA to the jury.

May 10, 1995 —
Prosecutors tried to link Simpson to the murders of Nicole and Goldman by using DNA test results. The jury entered the courtroom almost two hours after court was scheduled to start with the resumption (続行) of testimony from Dr. Cotton, director of Cellmark Diagnostics (診断分析) lab.
May 11, 1995 —
Prosecution DNA expert Robin Cotton testified that five blood drops found on Nicole's walkway possibly came from Simpson.

May 15, 1995 —
Defense attorney Peter Neufeld implied (暗示する) that Cellmark Lab has a financial interest and is therefore biased. A hearing (審理) was held after testimony regarding whether or not Simpson's friend and attorney Robert Kardashian should testify under oath (宣誓して) what he knows about Simpson's luggage.

May 16, 1995 —
The prosecution has called its second DNA expert, Gary Sims, in hopes of linking O.J. Simpson to the murders of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ron Goldman.

May 17, 1995 —
For the first time, a witness has placed murder victim Ron Goldman's blood in Simpson's Ford Bronco. Prosecutors want the jury to know that defense experts observed (監視する) prosecution DNA testing and had access to (入手する機会がある) the evidence.

May 18, 1995 —
The jury is again hearing astronomical odds (天文学的比率) linking Simpson to the murders of his ex-wife and her friend. A report from the Los Angeles Coroner's office reveals the medical examiner believed two knives may have been used in the murders.

May 19, 1995 (省略)
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May 22, 1995 —
The defense attempted to cast doubt (疑問を投げかける) on the quality of evidence. Jurors enjoyed a trip to the theater and a ride in a blimp (飛行船) this weekend.

May 23, 1995（省略）

May 24, 1995（省略）

May 25, 1995 —
Police Criminalist (犯罪学者) Collin Yamauchi, who set off a fire-storm (猛反撃を起こす) Wednesday when he said he understood Simpson had an alibi, testified he misnumbered (番号を間違えて付ける) tests on a summary sheet (要約記録).

May 26, 1995（省略）

May 30, 1995 —
The defense put criminalist Collin Yamauchi through a battery of questions (一連の質問をする) intended to show that he was sloppy (すさんである) in handling the evidence in the murder case. Defense attorney Johnnie Cochran said he's is concerned (心配している) about the possibility of losing another juror.

May 31, 1995 —
Judge Ito has ruled that the jury will see all of the autopsy photographs (検死写真) the prosecution sought to enter as exhibits (証拠物件として承認を求める). Cochran again raises the issue of the prosecution targeting (目標にする) jurors.
June Transcripts（6月）

June 1, 1995 —
The prosecution wrapped up (終える) its DNA phase of the trial, at least for now, and is preparing to question the coroner who conducted the audience (傍聴人) on slashing (切り付ける) victims Nicole and Goldman.

June 2, 1995 —
As the case shift from technical DNA evidence to gruesome (恐ろしい) details of the murder, Judge Ito warned the jurors they would be looking at unpleasant photographs.

June 5, 1995 —
Judge Ito decided to dismiss two more jurors—a hispanic woman and a black man.

June 6, 1995 —
The Los Angeles County chief medical examiner went over how the autopsies (検死) of Nicole and Goldman were conducted, including a string of errors that were made in handling evidence.

June 7, 1995 —
More graphic testimony—Dr. Lakshmanan Sathyavagiswaran detailed the events in the murders.

June 8, 1995 —
The Los Angeles County coroner said that Nicole was not sexually assaulted and there was no need to conduct extensive tests to document 71 —(110)
(文書に記録する) sexual activity.

June 9, 1995 —
Goldman may have tried to twist away (身をよじって避ける) as killer slashed his throat. Dr. Satayavagiswaran and Dr. Golden disagree over interpretations of Goldman’s wound.

June 12, 1995 —
Prosecutors said they will not call to the witness stand the controversial pathologist (問題の病理学者) who performed the autopsies on Goldman and Nicole.

June 13, 1995 —
Graphic testimony and photographs of stab wounds to Goldman’s chest, face and thigh proved too much for an alternate juror, and the judge quickly called a brief recess.

June 14, 1995 —
The Los Angeles County Coroner said that police did not notify his office in a timely fashion about the deaths of Nicole and Goldman, but that did not affect his ability to determine the time of death.

June 15, 1995 —
The prosecution has filed papers with the court seeking to admit two more witnesses who will testify about stalking (密かな追跡) and domestic violence incidents committed by Simpson against Nicole. The jurors seemed to pay close attention to Defense Attorney Robert Shapiro as he held a knife and demonstrated different ways of holding it and thrusting (刺す) it at an invisible victim. Many jurors were
taking notes off and on throughout the morning.

June 16, 1995 —
The prosecution called Richard Rubin back to the stand. Rubin is a former vice-president of Isotoner, which manufactured the pair of bloody gloves in evidence. One was found at the scene of the double murders on Bundy, the other was found behind the guest house on Simpson’s property. Rubin testified that the glove had probably shrunk to 85–percent of their original size because they had been wet and had dried.

June 19, 1995 —
An FBI shoe evidence expert testified that bloody shoe prints from the crime scene matched the size of the shoe that Simpson wears, size 12.

June 20, 1995 —
Prosecutors say tests have shown no evidence of the preservative on the rear condo gate or on the socks found in Simpson’s bedroom…. Despite this, for now, prosecutors will not call witnesses on the EDTA matter.

June 21, 1995 —
Simpson tried on a new pair of gloves, and this time they fit, although snugly (きつめ).

June 22, 1995 —
Transcripts of sidebar meeting reveal that prosecutor Darden had additional concerns about whether Simpson’s hands would fit into a new pair of Aris Isotoner gloves. Darden told Judge Ito that Simpson “has
arthritis (関節炎) and we looked at the medication (薬物治療) he takes and some of it is anti-inflammatory (反炎症性) and we are told he has not taken the stuff (薬) for a day and it caused swelling (腫れ) in the joints (関節) and inflammation (炎症) in his hands.”

June 23, 1995 —
Population geneticist (個体群遺伝学者) Dr. Weir admitted that on several blood stains where DNA tests showed “possible” genetic markers (遺伝子標識), he made calculations (計算) that were “biases” against Simpson.

June 26, 1995 —
A population geneticist testified that race is irrelevant when it comes to determining how often DNA patterns show up.

June 27, 1995 —
An LAPD technician told the jury for the first time that the knit cap found near the bodies of Nicole and Goldman had seven blond hairs, four dark hairs and some animal hairs attached to it with blood. Prosecutors contend the blue cap belonged to Simpson and he left it behind when he fled the crime scene.

June 28, 1995 —
Simpson’s defense attempted to suggest hair analysis is so vague it is like picking up a leaf and attempting to tell which tree it fell from. But Los Angeles Police Criminalist Susan Brockbank said “the point of doing a hair comparison is looking at a known sample to get a “range of characteristics... and then comparing that questioned hair to it.”
June 29, 1995 —
The Simpson’s defense team was successful in blocking crucial testimony that would have suggested that carpet fibers found on a bloody glove and on murder victims almost certainly came from Simpson’s Bronco.

June 30, 1995 —
An FBI hair and fiber expert said 12 hairs on a knit cap at the crime scene are consistent with Simpson’s. He said hairs in the cap found in the Bronco “exhibited the same microscopic characteristics that could have originated from the defendant.” And he said 12 hairs found in the knit cap at the crime scene also “exhibited the same microscopic characteristics” that indicated it came from Simpson.

July Transcripts（7月）

July 5, 1995（省略）

July 6, 1995 —
After five months and 58 witnesses, the prosecution finished with its last witness and rested its case. Under a litany of questions from Bailey, Deedrick said that no hair from Nicole was found in Simpson’s Bronco. He said that there was no hair consistent with Simpson’s on the Bundy or Rockham gloves. Nor were there hairs from Goldman or Nicole on a sock found at Simpson’s mansion.

July 7, 1995 —
CNN has learned Simpson’s oldest daughter Arnelle will be the first witness called on Monday when the defense begins its case (弁論を始
For all those speculating there will be no defense case, that 'the best defense is no defense at all', Johnnie Cochran told CNN he will absolutely put on a case. He feels compelled because of all the prosecution’s expert scientific testimony. Cochran says expert testimony must be challenged if he hopes to get an acquittal.

July 10, 1995 —
Simpson’s eldest daughter said her father was “upset, emotional and confused” when he heard that his ex-wife had been killed.

July 11, 1995 —
Three defense witnesses testified that they were in the vicinity of Nicole’s condo on the evening she was killed but none heard nor saw anything unusual.

July 12, 1995 —
A neighbor said he saw a white vehicle that “could have been a Bronco” speed away from the area near Nicole’s condo the night she and a friend were murdered.

July 13, 1995 —
A witness testified he picked up a calm and relaxed Simpson at the airport in Chicago, but less than two hours later – after hearing his ex-wife had been murdered – Simpson was “frantic, confused and desperate” and sounded like he was crying.

July 14, 1995 —
A doctor who examined Simpson following the murders said that two
cuts on Simpson’s third and fourth left fingers were both jagged (ぎざぎざ) and likely caused by glass.

July 17, 1995 —
A doctor who twice examined Simpson in the days following the murders said the former football star was physically capable of committing the murders.

July 18, 1995 —
Jurors got to see Simpson in an exercise video tape in which he joked about punching his wife. Judge Ito overruled defense objections (弁護側の異議を却下する) saying the statement is relevant because it was made close to the June 12, 1994 murders of Nicole and Goldman.

July 19, 1995 —
A tow truck (レッカー車) driver who admitted he took receipts from Simpson’s Bronco in an impound lot (押収車駐車場) said he did not see blood in the vehicle. But on questioning from prosecutors, John Meraz admitted he lied about taking the documents and also admitted that he did not carefully look at parts on the interior.

July 20, 1995 —
In a defeat (敗北) for the defense, the judge ruled that a defense expert cannot testify about the drying time of blood on socks.

July 21, 1995 —
CNN has learned that Simpson is being prepared to take the stand in his own defense, in case the defense team decides to put him on. “One reason to put him (Simpson) on would be that if for some reason we
should lose, we want to be able to look him in the eye and say he got the chance," one defense source tells Harris.

July 23, 1995 —
Simpson is being prepared in case it’s decided to have him testify at his murder trial. Defense sources tell CNN that Simpson had two sessions to prepare him for a possible stint (割り当て) on the witness stand. The meetings lasted a total of 1 2 hours and are described as being not rigorous in nature. The subjects included questions he might face under cross-examination.

July 24, 1995 —
A defense toxicologist (毒物専門家) testified that tests on a blood stains from socks found in Simpson’s bedroom and from a blood stain on the back gate at Nicole’s condo both indicated the presence of the preservative EDTA.

July 25, 1995 —
FBI scientist Roger Martz testified that one test he conducted showed traces similar to the preservative EDTA in a blood stain on a sock found in Simpson’s bedroom. However, he said what he found was not EDTA from preserved blood (保存血液).

July 26, 1995 —
FBI scientist Martz testified that tests on his own unpreserved blood showed a preservative could have been present but he wouldn’t identify it as being there.

July 27, 1995 —
A blood expert for the defense says a bloodstain on the ankle of a sock found in Simpson's bedroom is a direct-compression stain (直接押し付けられた血痕), not a spatter (はねた血の跡).

July 28, 1995 —
Court adjourned after lunch when one of the jurors suddenly became ill.

July 31, 1995 —
Blood expert, Herbert MacDonnell testified that there was blood on the inside of a sock found in Simpson's bedroom. He said, in his opinion, the blood got on the inside of the sock when the blood was pressed through the fabric on the opposite side with no foot in the sock.

August Transcripts (8月)

August 1, 1995 —
Prosecutor Clark said the prosecution intends to introduce evidence about Simpson's gloves, regardless of whether the defense introduces testimony about the drying time of gloves.

August 2, 1995 —
Defense DNA expert John Gerdès said LAPD has "persistent and chronic (継続的かつ常習的)" contamination problems.

August 3, 1995 —
The defense DNA expert said he had no confidence in blood samples taken from Simpson's Bronco.
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August 4, 1995 —
The defense DNA expert conceded (認める) that Simpson's blood samples were not contaminated during a critical stage in evidence gathering.

August 7, 1995 —
The prosecution used a defense witness in order to get DNA evidence damaging to Simpson back in front of the jury.

August 8, 1995 —
The defense is asking Judge Ito to conduct an independent investigation into whether Mark Fuhrman or other prosecution police witnesses committed perjury.

August 10, 1995 —
Defense expert Michael Baden testified that he and an assistant found that Nicole had suffered a bruise to the brain, an injury not documented by the L.A. Medical Examiner.

August 11, 1995 —
Defense blood expert Fredric Rieders testified that a blood preservative used by police was found in key evidence collected in the case. However, he could not say where the preservative came from.

August 14, 1995 —
Defense blood expert Rieders testified that EDTA, a blood preservative used by police, was found in evidence collected in the case.

August 15, 1995 —
In chambers: Judge Ito will not hear arguments on whether Mark Fuhrman’s tape can be heard by the jury, or whether Margaret York, Ito’s wife, can be called as a material witness (重要な証人).

August 16, 1995 —
The prosecution said it wants the trial to go with Judge Ito ruling on the admissibility of the Fuhrman tapes.

August 17, 1995 —
LAPD fingerprint expert Gilbert Aguilar testified that none of the latent fingerprints (残された指紋) found at the crime scene matched Simpson’s prints.

August 21, 1995 —
Forensic scientist John Ragle testified that evidence collected at the murder scene was not done properly and fell below minimum standards of practice (捜査の最低基準以下).

August 22, 1995 —
Christian Reichardt testified that he spoke to Simpson on the night of the murders and said Simpson seemed relaxed and jovial.

August 23, 1995 —
Defense expert Dr. Henry Lee testified that bloody imprints on Goldman’s jeans may have been caused by kicks from his assailant (加害者).

August 25, 1995 —
Judge Ito advised the prosecution not to tangle (争う) with defense
August 28, 1995 —
Defense expert Dr. Henry Lee did not accept the defense contention that the second set of footprints found at the murder scene night have been left by police officers. Lee said the imprints were not from the type of shoes normally worn by police.

August 29, 1995 —
Judge Ito allowed portions of the Mark Fuhrman tapes to be played.

August 30, 1995 —
The defense said it will change its strategy after Judge Ito ruled that only two excerpts from the Fuhrman tapes will be included in court. The defense will call witnesses to do a character attack (人格に関する攻撃) on Fuhrman.

September Transcripts（9月）

September 5, 1995 —
Witnesses testified about Mark Fuhrman’s character in court.

以上がCNNが作成した裁判の経過であったが、それには9月5日以降の記録は載っていなかったので、USA Todayが裁判終了後にまとめた経過報告を借用して不足分を補充することにする。

September 1995

SEPT. 5: Five witnesses, including McKinny, testify to Fuhrman’s use of racial epithet (人種差別発言) within last 10 years. At hearing with
jury out of room, Fuhrman invokes Fifth Amendment protection in further testimony.

SEPT. 7: Ito announces he'll give jury vague instruction about why Fuhrman will not testify; prosecution appeals.

SEPT. 8: Appeals court (上訴裁判所) rules Ito can not even give vague hint about Fuhrman invoking Fifth Amendment.

SEPT. 11: Defense refuses to rest (終了する) while appealing on Fuhrman; Ito orders prosecution to begin rebuttal (反論する); five photographers testify about pictures of O.J. wearing gloves like ones linked to crime.

SEPT. 12: Glove expert says he's “100% certain” gloves were same.

SEPT. 13: State crime lab expert says most sophisticated DNA test finds Goldman's blood in O.J.'s Bronco.

SEPT. 14: Prosecution forensics expert Douglas Deedrick rebuts defense contention that there was a second set of shoe prints at the murder scene.

SEPT. 15: Ito says county will not – as previously suggested – financially assist a juror who claimed possible loss of $1,500 in rental income.

SEPT. 18: Prosecution tentatively closes its rebuttal but reserves the right – exercised later (後程行使する) – to call more witnesses to rebut
new defense testimony.

SEPT. 19: Defense puts on former mobster Craig Anthony Fiano to portray L.A. detective Philip Vannatter as a liar. Simpson applies to register his name as an exclusive trademark.

SEPT. 20: Ito admonishes both sides: “It’s astonishing what we’ve sunk to,” as bickering over minor issues continues.

SEPT. 21: Ito announces his jury instructions will include possibility of finding Simpson guilty of second-degree murder — a major blow to the defense.

SEPT. 22: Simpson gets a chance to address the jury without being cross examined. He says he “did not, would not, could not have committed this crime.”

SEPT. 26: Clark begins her closing arguments by blasting her former star witness — Mark Fuhrman — as a racist but cautions that does not mean he planted key evidence at Simpson’s home.

SEPT. 27: Christopher Darden wraps up the prosecution closing arguments by portraying Simpson as consumed by a jealous rage. Cochran then takes up for the defense, hammering home the theme “If it doesn’t fit, you must acquit.”
SEPT. 28: Cochran invokes history and the bible and wraps up by telling jurors "God bless you." Barry Scheck says jurors cannot trust any of the DNA analysis on blood because of police contamination and tampering.

SEPT. 29: Over more than 60 objections from defense lawyers, Darden and Clark wrap up prosecution rebuttal with a video display of everything from the 1989911 call to photos of the bloody victims. At 4:08 pm Ito turns the case over to the jury, admonishing them to ignore warnings from both sides that "the world is watching."

October 1995

OCT. 2: Jury begins deliberations shortly after 9 am PT, breaks to hear the testimony of the limousine driver who picked Simpson up on the night of the murders, and returns a verdict.

OCT. 3: Verdict of not guilty is announced and O.J. Simpson is set free.

あとがき

以上で、この稿は終えておく。脱稿の現時点（1996年12月14日）では民事裁判が続行中で、原告側の証人喚問が12月9日に終わり、翌10日被告側証人の審問が開始されて現在に至っている。刑事裁判同様、民事裁判も陪審制で行われている。どのような評決がでるであろうか。民事ではシンプソン自身も証言せねばならず、刑事裁判のときとは大分異なった展開で進んでいる。結果はどうなるであろうか。筆者は次回のためにすでに大量
の資料を集めている。重要かつ興味ある資料を今回と同様な形式で掲載したいと計画している。

[付記] この報告は文部省特別研究助成「語学教育とその文化的背景」（代表三室次雄）グループで行った研究の一部である。