		14
	,	FILED CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
l	Priority	CLERK OS DISTRICT COOM
1	V Send	
	Cisd	100 80 2006
2	Enter	₩.¥
3	JS-5/JS-6	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNAL DISTRICT OF CA
اد	.IS-2/JS-3	
4	ENTERE CLERK, U.S. DISTI	D COURT
	<u> </u>	
5	NAL O	2006
	JUN 9	2000 5 E a
6		
7	CENTRAL DISTRICT C	OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY
,		. 5 °°
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT 🥼 🕒 🗒 🗒
_	CENTRAL DICTRI	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	THE ESTATE OF	DE CALIFORNIA S DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA CV 02-2929 FMC (RZx)
10	CHRISTOPHER G.L.	
11	CHRISTOPHER G.L. WALLACE, by and through its Personal Representatives, et al.,)
	Personal Representatives, et al.,	OBDER ON DEFENCE BEOLIEC
12	D1-:4:00-	ORDER ON DEFENSE REQUES? TO TERMINATE DISCOVERY
13	Plaintiffs,	10 TERMINATE DISCOVERT
13	vs.	
14		
	CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,	
15	D-64	(
1.0	Defendants.	₹
16	1	<
17		S
-,		,
18		

On May 23, 2006, the defense presented the Court with a copy of a report prepared by an investigator for plaintiffs' counsel. That report detailed an interview with Kenneth Boagni and had been in the possession of counsel for plaintiffs since November 2002. The report was four pages in length and contained virtually all of the statements, allegations, and representations which came to the attention of this Court last year. It was defendant's position, and the Court's initial reaction, that plaintiffs' counsel had misrepresented to the Court his surprise and shock at learning about this witness in the middle of trial.

Both sides have filed voluminous documents with the Court on the question of whether the Court had been deceived by plaintiffs' counsel. After having reviewed all of the evidence and arguments presented, the Court is satisfied that no

(418)

such deception took place.

The Court believes that when first confronted with Mr. Boagni's statements, in late 2002, counsel for plaintiffs reasonably believed that they were not credible. Boagni said he had told many officers of the Los Angeles Police Department that Perez confessed to him that he and David Mack had participated in the murder of Wallace. The complete lack of corroboration of such police reports convinced plaintiffs' counsel that there was no merit to the statements. What shocked plaintiffs' counsel during trial was not the information that Mr. Perez had allegedly confessed to Boagni, but that the police knew about it.

No discovery had been produced that even hinted at police interviews of Boagni, leading plaintiffs' counsel to conclude Boagni had been lying. In fact, as was unveiled during the days and weeks following the cessation and ultimate mistrial of the case, hundreds of documents concerning the many interviews of Boagni had been deliberately concealed by defendant.

In connection with this pending motion, defendant criticizes the quality of plaintiffs' discovery efforts and contends they should have asked better questions, dug deeper, or searched more thoroughly. The arguments, of course, are meaningless, because it is now obvious that no amount of discovery would have revealed these intentionally concealed documents.

The Court finds that plaintiffs' counsel misrepresented neither the surprise at the discovery that the police had actively investigated Mr. Boagni, nor its significance to this case. Plaintiffs may continue to take the depositions which the Court authorized following the recent revelation of a previously undisclosed Internal Affairs Investigation of Officers Mack and Perez for the murder of Wallace.

This matter is set for trial on October 16, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. Pre-Trial conference is set for September 18, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. All discovery is to be concluded by July 31, 2006.

June 8, 2006

FLORENCE-MARIE COOPER, Judge UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1.4.M 1.7. M.