1 2 3 4	JOSEPH D. ELFORD (S.B. No. 189934) Americans for Safe Access 1322 Webster St., Ste. 402 Oakland, CA 94612 Tel: (415) 573-7842 Fax: (510) 251-2036		
5 6	Counsel for Defendant TERRY G. WALKER		
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE ST	TATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
10			
11	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	)	No. BA278305
12	CALIFORNIA,	)	APPLICATION FOR ORDER
13	Plaintiff,	)	TO SHOW CAUSE RE: CONTEMPT OF COURT;
15		)	DECLARATIONS; PROPOSED ORDER
16	v.	)	Place: Department 122
17	TERRY G. WALKER,	į	•
18	Defendant.	)	No Hearing Scheduled
19		)	
20			
21	TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT; THE CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO; AND THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS		
22	ANGELES: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant	Torm, G	Wallzon ("Wallzon") hanaby mayor
23	TERASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant	1611y O	. walker ( walker ) hereby moves
24	Department 122 of this Honorable Court, the Honorable Craig E. Veals presiding, for an Order to		
25	Show Cause why a finding of contempt should not be made by the Court against the		
26	Respondents, City of Montebello Police, City of Montebello, and City Attorney for the City of		
27	Montebello, for their willful failure to comply with the Order to Return Seized Property issued		
-~	by this Court on March 13, 2006.		

This motion is made on the grounds that Walker has a valid order for the return of his property, including medical marijuana, yet Respondents refuse to comply with this Court's order and return Walker's property to him.

This Application is based on California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1209, 1211, 1212 and 1218(a); California Health and Safety Code section 11362.5, California Health and Safety Code sections 11362.7 et seq., Penal Code sections 1536, 1538.5 and 1540; article I, section 15 of the California Constitution; Garden Grove v. Superior Court (Kha) (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 355, this Court's inherent and supervisory powers, this notice of motion, the attached Declarations of Terry Walker and Joseph D. Elford; the attached memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, and such supplemental memoranda of points and authorities as may hereafter be filed with the court or stated at oral argument, on all papers and records on file in this action, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the time of the hearing.

Dated: December 26, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH D. ELFORD

Attorney for Defendant TERRY G. WALKER

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 15, 2004, the Montebello Police went to the home of Terry Walker ("Walker") and seized property from him, including 42 marijuana plants, cultivation lamps, personal correspondence, and books. (See Declaration of Terry Walker, attached hereto, at ¶2) After the charges were dismissed against Walker because of his status as a qualified medical marijuana patient under California law, this Court ordered that Mr. Walker's property be returned to him, including his marijuana. (Exhibit A)

Approximately one month later, in or around April 2006, Walker called the Montebello Police Department's Property Room and informed the officer who answered the telephone of the Order to Return Seized Property, issued by this Court on March 13, 2006. (See Exhibit A; Declaration of Terry Walker ¶4) Despite being notified of this valid court order, the officer stated the Police Department's refusal to return any of Walker's property to him. (See Declaration of Terry Walker ¶4)

To assist Walker obtain the compliance of the Montebello Police, the undersigned counsel drafted a letter to the City Attorney on June 7, 2007, which included a copy of this Court's order and requested an explanation for the noncompliance. (See Exhibit B; Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶3 & 4) The City Attorney did not respond in any way to the letter. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶4) This prompted the undersigned counsel to send a second letter to the City Attorney, dated January 10, 2008, which also went unanswered. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶5 & 6)

Meanwhile, the undersigned counsel was litigating Garden Grove v. Superior Court (Kha) (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 355, which was a case before the Fourth Appellate District,

Division Three, that addressed the question whether courts should order the return of medical marijuana improperly seized by the police. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶7) After years of litigation, the court issued a lengthy published decision on November 28, 2008. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶7) The California Supreme Court denied review of that case on March 19, 2008. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶7) And the case is now final, as the United States Supreme Court denied the City of Garden Grove's petition for writ of certiorari on December 1, 2008. (See Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶7)

Despite this authority and valid court orders, the Montebello Police refuse to return medical marijuana to Mr. Walker. (See Declaration of Terry Walker)

#### **ARGUMENT**

I.

## THIS COURT PROPERLY ISSUED AN ORDER FOR THE RETURN OF WALKER'S PROPERTY

In Garden Grove v. Superior Court (Kha) (2007) 157 Cal. App.4th 355, the court was called upon to decide whether superior courts should order the return of medical marijuana that was lawfully possessed under California law, but had been seized by the police. After noting that a negative answer to this question would frustrate the will of the California electorate when they enacted the Compassionate Use Act to ensure that qualified patients have the right to obtain and use marijuana without fear of criminal prosecution or sanction (id. at p. 388 [citing Health & Saf. Code, § 11362.5, subd. (b)(1)(A), (B)]), the court held that due process, as well as several Penal Code provisions, require the return of lawfully possessed property, including medical marijuana, to qualified patients (ibid. [citing Pen. Code, §§ 1417.5 [providing for return of exhibits in criminal case]; 1540 [restoration of property that was wrongfully taken pursuant to search warrant]; 1538.5, subd. (e) [return of property subject to successful search or seizure

 motion].) No California appellate court has held otherwise. (Cf. *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 455 [rendering such uncontroverted published decisions of appellate courts binding on all superior courts.)

Based on its authority under the Penal Code, as well as its inherent power, this Court properly ordered the return of Walker's property, including his medical marijuana, on March 13, 2006. (See Exhibit A)

#### II.

### THE COURT HAS THE POWER TO FIND RESPONDENTS IN CONTEMPT OF COURT

Because it is expected that the public abide judicial orders, California Code of Civil Procedure section 1209(a) makes punishable by contempt of court "disobedience of any lawful judgment, order, or process of the court." In addition, courts have the inherent power to punish acts that interfere with the orderly conduct of proceedings. (See *In re Buckley* (1973) 10 Cal.3d 237, 247.)

In the instant case, a valid Order to Return Seized Property was issued by this Court on March 13, 2006. (Exhibit A) Despite repeatedly being presented with this order, the Montebello Police and the Montebello City Attorney refuse to comply with the order and return any of Walker's property to him. (See Declaration of Terry Walker ¶4; Declaration of Joseph D. Elford ¶3-6) Respondents' knowing refusal to abide this Court's order, with which it could comply, is willful and constitutes indirect contempt, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1211. For this reason, this Court should commence contempt proceedings against Respondents. (See Warner v. Superior Court (1954) 126 Cal.App.2d 821, 824; see also People v. Superior Court (Laff) (2001) 25 Cal.4th 703, 713 [officers who seize property "do so on behalf of the court"]; People v. Superior Court (Loar) (1972) 28 Cal.App.3d 600, 610 [resolution of criminal

proceedings "did not confer on the seizing officer any right to retain the property independent of and beyond that derived from the search warrant"].)

#### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Walker requests that this Court issue an order to show cause why Respondents should not be held in contempt and made to pay an appropriate fine and Walker's attorney fees.

Dated: December 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH D. ELFORD

Attorney for Defendant TERRY G. WALKER

#### **DECLARATION OF TERRY G. WALKER**

I, Terry G. Walker, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a qualified medical marijuana patient under California law, authorized to cultivate and possess marijuana for my medical use.
- 2. On October 15, 2004, the Montebello Police came to my home and seized approximately 42 marijuana plants, 22 cultivation lamps, my personal correspondence and books.
- 3. After the marijuana cultivation charges against me we dismissed because of my status as a qualified patient, this Court issued an Order to Return Seized Property on March 13, 2006. The order explicity states: "Montebello Police Department is to return all property seized from Defendant TERRY GENE WALKER. Returned property shall include all marijuana." A true and correct copy of this Court's order is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 4. Approximately one month later, in or around April 2006, I telephoned the Montebello Police Department's Property Room and informed the officer who answered the telephone of the Order to Return Seized Property, issued by this Court on March 13, 2006. Despite being notified of the valid court order, the officer stated the Police Department's refusal to return any of my property to me.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 27 day of July, 2008, in San Diego, California.

TERRY G. WALKER

#### DECLARATION OF JOSEPH D. ELFORD

I, Joseph D. Elford, declare as follows:

- I am a member in good standing with the State bar of California and represent defendant Terry Walker in this action. I am also Chief Counsel for Americans for Safe Access, which is a nonprofit devoted to assisting medical marijuana patients.
- 2. After Mr. Walker informed me that he had obtained a court order for the return of his property, but the Montebello Police, nonetheless, refused to return it to him, I sought to assist Mr. Walker obtain compliance with the order.
- 3. To this end, I drafted a letter to the Montebello City Attorney on June 7, 2007, which included a copy of this Court's order and requested an explanation for the Police Department's noncompliance. A true and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 4, The Montebello City Attorney did not respond in any way to my letter, dated June 7, 2007.
- 5. On January 10, 2008, I wrote another letter to the Montebello City Attorney requesting an explanation for the Police Department's refusal to abide this Court's order. A true and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit C.
  - 6. Again, the Montebello City Attorney did not respond to my letter.
- 7. Meanwhile, on behalf of Real Party in Interest Felix Kha, I was litigating Garden Grove v. Superior Court (Kha) (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 355, in the Fourth Appellate District, Division Three. That case involved a very similar set of facts as those present here a police department refusing to comply with a valid court order for the return of property. The court held in a lengthy published decision, dated November 28, 2007, that such orders are appropriate and

1		1
2		
3		
4		•
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	l	
17		ŀ
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
	١	ı

the police must comply with such orders. The California Supreme Court denied review of *Garden Grove* on March 19, 2008. The United States denied the city's petition for writ of certiorari on December 1, 2008.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this  $\mathcal{U}^{\mu}$  day of December, 2008, in Oakland, California.

JOSEPH D. ELFORD

1	JOSEPH D. ELFORD (S.B. No. 189934)		
2	Americans for Safe Access 1322 Webster St., Ste. 402		
3	Oakland, CA 94612		
4	Tel: (415) 573-7842 Fax: (510) 251-2036		
5	Counsel for Defendant TERRY G. WALKER		
6			
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
9	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ) No. BA278305		
10	CALIFORNIA, ) (PROPOSED) ORDER		
11	Plaintiff,		
12	v. )		
13	TERRY G. WALKER,		
14	Defendant.		
15	)		
16			
17	Good cause appearing, Respondents Montebello Police Department, City of Montebello,		
18	and Montebello City Attorney are hereby ordered to show cause why they should not held in		
19   20	contempt for failing to abide this Court's order, dated March 13, 2006.		
21	The hearing will take place in Department 122 of this Court, 210 West Temple Street,		
22	Los Angeles, CA 90012, at 8:30 a.m. on		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
24	II IS SO ORDERED.		
25			
26	Dated:		
27			
28	The Hon. Craig E. Veals		
- 1	1		

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of California over the age of eighteen years and not a party to this action. My business address is 1322 Webster St., Suite 402, Oakland, CA 94612. On December 26, 2008, I served the within document:

#### APPLICATION RE: CONTEMPT

via first-class mail upon:

District Attorney
Los Angeles County
210 West Temple St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

City Attorney City of Montebello 1600 West Beverly Blvd Montebello, CA 90640

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on this 26 day of December, 2008, in Oakland, California.

Jøseph D. Elford

	Jacek W. Lentz, Esq. (State Bar No. 213198)  SHEVIN & LENTZ  9000 W. Sunset Bivd, Suite 720  CONFORMED COPY  OF ORIGINAL FILED  Los Angeles Superior Court	
3	Los Angeles, CA 90069 Telephone: (310) 273 - 1300 MAD 1 3 7006	
4	Facsimile: (310) 2/3-1302	
5	Attorneys for Defendant TERRY GENE WALKER  By  Deputy	
6	OF CALIFORNIA	
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	ł
8	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	ĺ
9		
	Case No. BA278305	
10	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, [PROPOSED] ORDER TO RETURN	
11	Plaintiff, SEIZED PROPERTY	
12	V3.	
13		
14	TERRY GENE WALKER,  Defendant	
15	Delemant	
16		
17	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:  Montebello Police Department is to return all property seized from Defendant TERRY GENE	
	Montebello Police Department is in return an property	
18	WALKER. Returned property shall include all marijuana.	
19	and all states of the states o	
20	DATED: 3-13-06 Superior Court	,
21		
22	CALADOR	1
23		ļ
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20	ORDER TO RETURN PROPERTY -1-	
	OKINER TO KET DICET BOT MALE	



Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel Americans for Safe Access 1322 Webster St. Suite 402 Oakland, CA 94612 (415) 573-7842

June 7, 2007

City Attorney City of Montebello 1600 West Beverly Blvd Montebello, CA 90640

Re: People v. Walker, Case No. BA278305

To Whom it May Concern:

I am an attorney for Americans for Safe Access, an Oakland-based non-profit, which advocates on behalf of medical marijuana patients. I was contacted by medical marijuana patient Terry Walker regarding the seizure of his medical marijuana on or about October 15, 2004. I write to you to assist Mr. Walker in his efforts to secure the return of the approximately 42 marijuana plants seized from him on that date.

The issue of the return of Mr. Walker's medicine has already been litigated in the Superior Court. After Mr. Walker demonstrated that he lawfully possessed the marijuana at issue for his medical use, pursuant to the Compassionate Use Act (Health & Safety Code § 11362.5), the court, by the attached order dated March 13, 2006, ordered the Montebello Police Department to return the approximately 42 plants seized from Mr. Walker.

Despite this order, Mr. Walker was orally informed on October 15, 2004 by the Montebello Police Department that it would not return the 42 plants seized from him. I am requesting that you inform me of the Department's official position regarding whether it will comply with the attached order and, if it will not, the reason for noncompliance.

While I would prefer to resolve this matter amicably, I would like to inform you that we are prepared to initiate contempt proceedings in the Superior Court if the City of Montebello does not soon notify me of its intent to honor the attached court order for the return of property. If we are required to litigate this matter by way of a contempt proceeding, we will be seeking costs and attorney's fees pursuant to subsection 1218(a) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Your earliest attention to this matter is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel

Americans for Safe Access

(415) 573-7842

Attachment

Jacek W. Lentz, Esq. (State Bar No. 213198) CONFORMED COPY SHEVIN & LENTZ 9000 W. Sunset Blvd, Suite 720 Los Angeles Superior Court 2 Los Angeles, CA 90069 Telephone: (310) 273 - 1300 MAR 13 2008 3 Facsimile: (310) 273 - 1362 4 Attorneys for Defendant TERRY GENE WALKER 5 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 8 9 Case No. BA278305 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF 10 [PROPOSED] ORDER TO RETURN CALIFORNIA. SEIZED PROPERTY 11 Plaintiff, 12 13 TERRY GENE WALKER, 14 Defendant. 15 16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT: - Montebello Police Department is to return all property seized from Defendant TERRY GENE 17 18 grijuana. WALKER. Returned property shall inc 19 20 DATED: 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 5408873.1 ORDER TO RETURN PROPERTY



Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel Americans for Safe Access 1322 Webster St. Suite 402 Oakland, CA 94612 (415) 573-7842

January 10, 2008

City Attorney City of Montebello 1600 West Beverly Blvd Montebello, CA 90640

Re: People v. Walker, Case No. BA278305

To Whom it May Concern:

On June 7, 2007, I sent you a letter regarding the above-captioned case, to which you did not respond (see attached). Since that time, the Court of Appeal for the Fourth Appellate District issued a published decision in *Garden Grove v. Superior Court (Kha)* (Nov. 28, 2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 355, which affirms that courts must order the return of medical marijuana seized by the police where there is no probable cause to believe that the patient from whom it was seized has committed any crime under state law. For this reason, I once again write to request whether you will abide the Superior Court's order in this case requiring the return of Mr. Walker's medical marijuana and, if not, your reasons for noncompliance.

To refresh your recollection, on or about October 15, 2004, the Montebello Police seized approximately 42 marijuana plants from Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker, then, filed a motion for return of property in the Superior Court and, after he demonstrated that he lawfully possessed the marijuana at issue for his medical use, pursuant to the Compassionate Use Act (Health & Safety Code § 11362.5), the Court, by the attached order dated March 13, 2006, ordered the Montebello Police Department to return the approximately 42 plants seized from him. The Montebello Police, however, despite being presented with a copy of this order have informed Mr. Walker that they will not return the seized marijuana to him.

While I would prefer to resolve this matter amicably, I will inform you that we are prepared to initiate contempt proceedings in the Superior Court if the City of Montebello does not soon notify me by January 24, 2008, of its intent to honor the attached court order for the return of property. If we are required to litigate this matter by way of a contempt proceeding, we will be seeking costs and attorney's fees pursuant to subsection 1218(a) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Your earliest attention to this matter is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel

Americans for Safe Access

(415) 573-7842

Attachments



Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel Americans for Safe Access 1322 Webster St. Suite 402 Oakland, CA 94612 (415) 573-7842

June 7, 2007

City Attorney City of Montebello 1600 West Beverly Blvd Montebello, CA 90640

Re: People v. Walker, Case No. BA278305

To Whom it May Concern:

I am an attorney for Americans for Safe Access, an Oakland-based non-profit, which advocates on behalf of medical marijuana patients. I was contacted by medical marijuana patient Terry Walker regarding the seizure of his medical marijuana on or about October 15, 2004. I write to you to assist Mr. Walker in his efforts to secure the return of the approximately 42 marijuana plants seized from him on that date.

The issue of the return of Mr. Walker's medicine has already been litigated in the Superior Court. After Mr. Walker demonstrated that he lawfully possessed the marijuana at issue for his medical use, pursuant to the Compassionate Use Act (Health & Safety Code § 11362.5), the court, by the attached order dated March 13, 2006, ordered the Montebello Police Department to return the approximately 42 plants seized from Mr. Walker.

Despite this order, Mr. Walker was orally informed on October 15, 2004 by the Montebello Police Department that it would not return the 42 plants seized from him. I am requesting that you inform me of the Department's official position regarding whether it will comply with the attached order and, if it will not, the reason for noncompliance.

While I would prefer to resolve this matter amicably, I would like to inform you that we are prepared to initiate contempt proceedings in the Superior Court if the City of Montebello does not soon notify me of its intent to honor the attached court order for the return of property. If we are required to litigate this matter by way of a contempt proceeding, we will be seeking costs and attorney's fees pursuant to subsection 1218(a) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Your earliest attention to this matter is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joseph D. Elford Chief Counsel

Americans for Safe Access (415) 573-7842

Attachment

1 2 3 4	Jacek W. Lentz, Esq. (State Bar No. 213198) SHEVIN & LENTZ 9000 W. Sunset Blvd, Suite 720 Los Angeles, CA 90069 Telephone: (310) 273 - 1300 Facsimile: (310) 273 - 1362	CONFORMED COPY  OF ORIGINAL FILED  Los Angeles Superior Court  MAR 1 3 2008  John A. Chaing: Engagement Unicer/Glank
5	Attorneys for Defendant TERRY GENE WALKER	By Caputy
6		OF CALIFORNIA
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	
8	FOR THE COUNTY O	OF LOS ANGELES
9		
10	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	Case No. BA278305
11	CALIFORNIA,	[PROPOSED] ORDER TO RETURN SEIZED PROPERTY
12	Plaintiff,	2FIVED I KO. E.K.
13	Vŝ.	
14	TERRY GENE WALKER,	
15	Defendant.	
ı		
16	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:	a a ample Crair
17	Montebello Police Department is to return al	I property seized from Defendant TERRY GENE
18	WALKER. Returned property shall include an mar	ijuana.
19		Mary Weals
20	DATED: 3-13-06 (2)	Jarge of the Superior Court
21		
22	CARADON	
23		
24	··	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	ORDER TO RETURN PROPERTY -1	5408873.1

FAX NO. : 6195430043

Jan. 88 2897 P1:25PM P1

# California Health & Safety Code Section 11362.5

# Physician's Statement

Patient Name TERRY WALKER

Date of Birth August/10/1953

Driver's License/ID No N0764898

This is to certify that I am a licensed physician in the State of California, that I am the above-Patient SSN referenced patient's treating physician, and that this patient is under my medical care and supervision for the treatment of:

ICD # 070.54

ICD#716.1

# CERVICAL DISC DEGENERATIVE DISEASE

I further certify that I have assessed this patient's medical history and medical condition. My parient has informed me that cannabis is providing/may provide relief for related symptoms of the above-referenced diagnosis (cs). Based upon my examination of the Pstient, I deem the uso of cannabis helpful for the treatment of Chronic Conditions and recommend the patient use approximately FIFTY-TWO(52) gram(s) per day, as needed, or an amount consistent with patient needs per 11362,77(a), (b) and (c).

I have discussed with my patient the potential risks and benefits of the medical use of cannabis and other interventions, both pharmacological and mn-phermacological. In addition, I have informed my patient that the medical use of camabis is restricted under Federal Law; however, if this patient chooses to continue to use cannabis therapeutically, I will cominue to monitor his/her medical condition and progress. Date 08/07/06

Signature of Physician

4.19 7.15

Printed Name of Physician: Robert F. Sterner, Jr., MD 1516 W Redwood #202

CA Medical License No. G51708

San Diego CA 92101 619-543-1061/442-4215

Expiration Date of Document FEBRUARY /07/ 2007

NOTE: This recummendation is effective (b) Twelve muntile from the above referenced date of insur-NOTICE OF PATIENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO FAX THEIR BECOMMENDATION TO CO OF REFORE GOING. We require up to 24 (twenty-four) hours from the time of the call for us to authenticate your recommendation by phone. You reduce the wait for your medicine by faxing your recommendation to the co-op the day before you go. ⊕ To reduce delay; have your co-op fax your recommendation to us at 619-543-0043 today! 
 ⊕

٠	
1 2 3 4 5	SHEVIN & LENTZ, Attorneys at Law Eric D. Shevin, Esq. (State Bar No. 160103) Jacek W. Lentz, Esq. (State Bar No. 213198) Stephen J. Fisch, Esq. (State Bar No. 240774) 9000 W. Sunset Blvd, Suite 720 West Hollywood, CA 90069 Telephone: (310) 273 - 1300 Facsimile: (310) 273 - 1362  Attorneys for Defendant TERRY GENE WALKER
. 7	
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9"	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
10	
	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF Case No. BA278305
11	CALIFORNIA, SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY
12	Plaintiff,
13	
14	VS.
15	TERRY GENE WALKER,
16	Defendant.
17	Too Elfowd
18	The undersigned Defendant, TERRY GENE WALKER, does hereby appoint Joe Elford,
19	Esq., as attorney of record in the above titled action.
20	agreed the thickney to the second of the sec
21	e e
22	Y 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
23	I do hereby agree to the Substitution of Attorney:
24	Dated: Feb. 28, 2007 /eny Walks
	Terry Gene Walker, Defendant
25	
26	
27	
28	

-1-

S408873.1

SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

-	
1	I hereby agree to the Substitution of Attorney:
2	Dated: May 31, 2007 Josh O. Elford
3	Joe Elford, Esq.
4	
5	I hereby agree to the Substitution of Attorney:
6	Dated: Tob. 2007 Mick Vents
7	Jacek Lentz, Esq. (former attorney of record)
.8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

-2-

SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

S408873.1