

Thereupon JACK N. HANSEN, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION OF PROS. JUROR JACK N. HANSEN

By the Court:

Q Is your name Jack N. Hansen? ✓

A Yes, sir.

Q And you live on Giles Road in Moreland Hills Village?

A Yes, sir.

Q How long have you lived on Giles Road, Mr. Hanson?

A Five years.

Q Have you a family?

A Yes, sir.

Q What does your family consist of?

A Wife and one boy.

Q How old is the boy?

A Eight.

Q And how long -- you said you lived there five years. Is your household composed of yourself and wife and boy only?

A Pardon?

Q Any other people living with you other than your --

A My mother-in-law is living with me.

Q What is your occupation or business?

A General foreman.

Q Where do you do that?

A At the Oliver Corporation.

Q Where is their place of business?

A 193rd and Euclid. It is actually in Euclid Village. It is just across the line.

Q What do they do?

A Manufacturer of crawler-type tractors.

Q How long have you been connected with that corporation?

A 16 years.

Q Have you ever served as a juror before?

A No, sir.

Q Ever appeared in any court as a witness in any case, civil or criminal?

A No, sir.

Q Have any of your members of your family -- and by your family I mean your wife's as well as your own -- ever been visited by violence at the hands of another person?

A No, sir.

Q Are there any members of your family who are members of a police department or any law-enforcing agency anywhere, if you know?

A Not to my knowledge, no, sir.

Q Do you know any of these good people that were named here this morning?

A Other than your introduction, no.

Q Do you know the Prosecuting Attorney, Mr. Frank T. Cullitan,

or any member of his staff?

A No, sir.

Q Do you know the Sheriff or any member of his staff?

A No, sir.

Q Or the Coroner, Dr. Gerber, or any member of his staff?

A No, sir.

Q Have you any objection in a proper case to capital punishment?

MR. CORRIGAN: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. CORRIGAN: Exception.

A No, sir.

Q You said no?

A No. Yes, I said no.

Q Do you understand, Mr. Hanson, that it is the function of the jury, and it is the function exclusively to determine what the facts are in a case of this kind, in other words, determine whether a person charged with crime is guilty or innocent, and that no one can interfere with the jury in the performance of that function? You understand that, do you?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q And do you understand, also, that the jury do that on the basis solely of the evidence which is produced in this case?

A Yes, sir.

Q And the instructions of the Court as to the law applicable

to the case?

A Yes, sir.

Q And do you understand also that without regard to where evidence comes from in this witness chair, whether it is from a public official, a professional man or a common laborer, that at the outset it is the same, and it is to be tested on the same basis?

A Yes, sir.

Q And that test being only what is true and what is not true. You understand that?

A Yes, sir, I understand that.

Q I would like to know if, since the 4th day of July of this year, and particularly since your name has appeared in the newspapers as a prospective juror here, if you have received any communication of any kind from anybody about it?

A Well, what do you mean by communication? You mean conversation with anybody, or outside calls, or -- I don't quite understand.

Q Yes. First of all, by mail, by telegram or telephone?

A No, sir, I have not.

Q And have you had any discussions with people about the matter?

A Yes. Brief discussions. Not since my name has been in the paper, no. Prior to that, yes.

Q You have, I take it, read newspapers and heard radio comment, have you?

A Yes, sir.

Q Television, and so forth, and discussed it with other people at different times?

A Yes, sir.

Q Have you as a result of anything that you have read or heard or discussed formed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Dr. Sheppard?

A No, sir.

Q And are you satisfied that you could sit here and listen to evidence and be absolutely fair and impartial on the basis of that evidence and the instructions as to the law?

A I believe I could.

Q You are sure you could?

A I think I could.

Q Well, we want a little more certainty than that.

A I feel fairly certain I could, yes, sir.

Q You are satisfied that you could?

A Yes, I think I could.

THE COURT: This is Mr. Parrino
of the prosecutor's staff. He would like to put a
few questions to you, sir.

EXAMINATION OF PROS. JUROR JACK N. HANSEN

By Mr. Parrino:

Q Mr. Hansen, we are about to ask you some questions, in

addition to those that Judge Blythin has already asked, for the purpose of determining your qualifications to serve as a juror on this case. You understand that, of course?

A Yes.

Q Now, I think you told us that you served -- that you are employed as a general foreman at the Oliver Corporation?

A Yes, sir, that's correct.

Q And that has been for approximately 16 years, is that correct?

A Not under that capacity, no. I have been with the Oliver Corporation for 16 years.

Q What have been some of your other duties while you worked there?

A Well, I started out there in the shipping room and stayed in the traffic division all the way through. I was put in full charge of our Plant No. 2 during the war, and then I became a general foreman.

Q As general foreman, what do your duties include, please?

A As a general foreman my duties are overseeing of other foremen, particularly in the traffic division and material division.

Q Is Mrs. Hansen employed anywhere?

A No, she isn't.

143

Q Now, you told us, Mr. Hansen, that coming into this courtroom as a prospective juror, you have read from time to time something about this case, which is only natural,

A Yes, sir.

Q There has been considerable publicity given to this case in the newspapers of this community for some time, that's correct, is it not?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you recall when it was that you first read about the case?

A When?

Q Yes.

A No, I couldn't swear to it. I suppose the first day it appeared in the paper I read it. I don't recall.

Q About the time that it happened?

A I imagine so, yes, sir.

Q You didn't form any opinion at that time as to the guilt or innocence of Sam Sheppard, did you, Mr. Hanson?

A No, sir.

Q And from that time up until the time that you received your notice that you were to be a prospective juror, on and off you have read something about the proceedings here, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And I take it that you have had occasion to speak to other people about this or have them speak to you about this, haven't they?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, as a result of everything that you have read and what

you have heard by other people, and perhaps on the radio and perhaps on television, I understand that you have not formed any fixed opinion one way or the other as to the guilt or the innocence of Sam Sheppard at this time, is that correct?

A Yes, sir, that's correct.

Q And coming into this courtroom, as you have, you are in a position to weigh the evidence as you hear it in the courtroom, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And set aside anything that you have heard or read previously, take your impressions only from the witnesses as you get them here? Will you do that, please?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, you have stated, of course, that you have not previously served as a juror, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you have not served as a witness in any type of case?

A No, sir.

Q Now, Mr. Hanson, you understand that this is certainly a very important matter?

A Yes, I understand that.

Q It is important certainly to the defendant, Sam Sheppard, and it is also important to the State of Ohio, which is represented by the prosecution side of the table here.

Now, coming into this courtroom as a juror, you will be called upon to listen to a great volume of testimony as it comes to the jury from the witness stand. Various persons will testify on both sides. You appreciate, of course, that there will be a conflict in the evidence here, and that the jury sitting patiently listening to the evidence, it will be one of their functions to attempt to resolve that conflict and determine exactly what the facts are in this case.

A Yes, sir, I realize that.

Q And will you give to all of the testimony of all of the witnesses of both sides your undivided attention and interest throughout the trial?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, after all of that testimony has been completed, all of the mass of evidence is in, then Judge Blythin, who has certainly a very important job in this trial, he will give to you and describe for you in detail what the laws are of Ohio as they pertain to this specific case. There are many laws that pertain to many different types of offenses. Certainly you appreciate that there are fixed laws that apply to civil cases in contrast to a criminal case.

Now, will you take the law that Judge Blythin gives to you in this trial?

A Yes, sir.

Q And apply those laws to the facts in the case? Will you do that, please?

A Yes, sir.

Q And if, as a result of what you hear from the witnesses and as the result of what you hear from Judge Blythin in his charge to you as to the law, you have the abiding conviction that the defendant is not guilty of the charge set forth in the indictment, you will not hesitate, will you, sir, to return a verdict of not guilty, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Now, on the other hand, after you have heard all of the evidence, after Judge Blythin has given you the law, after you have discussed the case with fellow-jurors in your deliberation room, and you, as a juror, are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant of the charge in the indictment, will you then hesitate to return a verdict of guilty?

A I will not.

Q Now, of course, you appreciate, I am sure, Mr. Hansen, that in any issue, whatever the issue may be, where there is a conflict as to a question of fact, the jury will, in deciding what the facts are, take certain specific things into consideration. Judge Blythin will say to you those things that you may take into consideration in determining what the facts are or how you will judge the witnesses. You under-

stand what I mean?

A Yes, sir.

Q In other words, Judge Blythin will state to you as follows:

That in judging the credibility of witnesses you can take into consideration their entire story, what they have stated, and you may take into consideration whether or not to you, as a juror, the story that that particular witness relates is reasonable or not reasonable. You understand that?

A Yes, sir.

Q And if Judge Blythin states to you that that is the law of the State of Ohio, will you follow that law, please?

A Yes, sir.

Q And, of course, if you, as a result of weighing the testimony of all the witnesses, feel that a particular witness' statements to you, as an individual, with a logical mind, do not seem reasonable then, of course, will you attach less weight or credit to the testimony of that witness?

A I'm afraid I don't quite understand. You said speak to me individually. Now, if I am a juror, I'm not supposed to be spoken to individually.

Q That's correct. I misworded the question, sir.

Now, if a person testifies from the witness stand, and after you have listened to it you feel that what that

person has stated doesn't seem reasonable to you, it certainly does not seem reasonable, now, you will give less weight to the testimony of that witness, would you not, sir?

A I would try to pick out the facts.

Q Yes. And that would be your job, of course. In other words, out of the testimony of each witness it will be for you to determine that which you believe and that which you disbelieve. Do you understand that?

A Yes, I understand that.

Q And in determining what you will believe and what you will not believe, Judge Blythin will state to you that you can take into consideration whether or not a witness' story is reasonable or probable or unreasonable or not probable. You understand that?

A Yes, I understand that.

Q And, of course, naturally it follows, here in the courtroom or anywhere, wherever your experience may lead to, that if what a person says to you, if he is a witness or any person, if what that person states to you sounds reasonable and probable, you believe him, isn't that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And if what a person states to you does not sound reasonable or probable, you don't believe them; it is as simple as that, is it not?

A That's correct.

Q Now, similarly, Judge Blythin will say to you that you can take into consideration the interest that a person has in this case in sizing up his testimony. For instance, if a person has a great interest in any case, you would be inclined to take his testimony with a grain of salt, perhaps, is that correct?

A Well, I would try to pick out the facts, yes. Yes, I would try to make my own decision as to whether his factor--

Q That's right, and if Judge Blythin states to you that you may take into account the interest or lack of interest of a particular witness in sizing up his testimony, will you follow his instructions in that regard?

A I will be guided by the Judge, yes, sir.

Q Judge Blythin has stated to you that the trial here involves first degree murder. Of course, you know that to be a fact, do you not?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you have stated that you have no objections to capital punishment, is that correct, sir?

A That's correct.

Q So that where you as a juror come to hear this case, and you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant, you could enter into a verdict which might take a human life, is that correct, sir?

A Yes, sir.

Q And certainly you appreciate the very grave seriousness and importance of a task of this kind, do you not?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q And you are willing to assume the obligation, the duty of serving here as a juror in this case, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q You are not acquainted with any of the parties in this lawsuit, are you?

A No, sir.

Q You are not acquainted with anyone at Bay View Hospital, are you?

A No.

Q Are you acquainted with any members of the defendant's family, so far as you can recall?

A No, sir, not that I know of.

Q Are you acquainted with anyone that directly is acquainted with the defendant?

A No, sir.

Q Or any member of his family?

A If so, not to my knowledge.

Q Yes. So, certainly, you are not acquainted, as you have stated, with any members of the prosecution, is that correct?

A No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Q None of the lawyers in this case?

A Not that I know of.

Q You come into this courtroom completely detached from any personal contact with any of the parties to this lawsuit, so far as you know?

A That's right.

Q Now, in a courtroom, sir, we have both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence, especially in a criminal case, and the Court will say to you in his charge finally that here both types of evidence are proper in a criminal case.

Now, if Judge Blythin states that to you, will you take that to be the law in Ohio?

A Yes, sir.

Q And Judge Blythin will describe for you as to what is direct evidence and what is circumstantial evidence, and I am sure that you will take his description of those two matters to be the law in the State of Ohio? Will you do that, please?

A Yes, sir.

145 Q Now, Judge Blythin will state to you that direct evidence is something that you see or hear, that you can determine from your own senses, whereas, circumstantial evidence are the reasonable inferences that may be shown from proven facts. That is a brief description of those two, and when, as I say, Judge Blythin describes them to you, you will follow his instructions as to those two matters? You will do that, please?

A Yes, sir, I will.

Q Now, Mr. Hansen, you appreciate, of course, that in determining and judging any case that it is important that you decide the case free from bias or prejudice or sympathy, so should you be selected as a juror in this trial, do you feel that you could come to your decision insofar as it is humanly possible without any feelings of prejudice against anyone?

A Yes, sir, I believe I could.

Q Or without any feelings of bias against anyone?

A Yes, sir.

Q Or without any feelings of sympathy toward anyone?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you feel that you could do that?

A Yes.

Q Toward the defendant, or anyone else, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q So only you can decide, sir, on the basis of what Judge Blythin states to you, what I state to you, and what Mr. Corrigan and the gentlemen for the defense may state to you, whether or not you feel honestly and conscientiously that you could serve as a juror. Nobody can tell you that, isn't that correct?

A I understand.

Q You must tell us.

A That's right.

Q In other words, we can't pry into your mind. You know the privacy of your own thoughts, your own background, the nature of this case, and can you think of any possible reason why you could not serve as a juror in this trial, sir?

A No, sir, I can't.

Q Judge the case fairly and impartially to both sides?

A Yes, I feel I could.

Q And let justice be done?

A That's right.

MR. DANACEAU: Thank you very much.

Pass for cause.

THE COURT: That gentleman is Mr.

Garmone, one of defense counsel. He would like to put a few questions.

EXAMINATION OF PROS. JUROR JACK N. HANSEN

By Mr. Garmone:

Q Mr. Hansen, it hasn't been stated to you that you are now being examined to participate in this case as an alternate juror.

A You say has it been stated?

Q It has not.

A It has not, no.

Q The purpose of this examination, and the purpose for the calling of all of the jurors, is that the Court feels that

this trial will take a considerable length of time, so to insure no delay in the event that one of the other twelve ladies and gentlemen in the box are seated and sworn becomes ill, that you then can move into their position.

Now that you understand that your participation may be only that of an alternate juror, you won't take that as not giving your full attention to the facts that you hear in this courtroom?

A No, sir. I would be just as attentive as if I were a juror.

Q You would treat it as such, would you not?

A Yes, sir.

Q There have been considerable questions asked of you, some by his Honor, Judge Blythin, and some by Mr. Parrino. Our purpose in examining anyone is only to determine whether or not the person is qualified to deal with this matter fairly. We only ask fair play. We ask fair play for this young man, and we ask that you give the same fair play to the State.

Now, some of the questions that I will ask may be somewhat personal, and I do that not to pry into your affairs but only to help you determine, and help everybody around this table determine, whether you can qualify or not.

Now, you said that you live at Giles Road in Moreland Hills Village for the past five years, is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Where was your residence prior to that?

A East Cleveland.

Q And what street in East Cleveland?

A Gainesboro.

Q Now, do you know the Weigles that live in East Cleveland?

A What was that name?

Q The Weigles. W-e-i-g-l-e.

A No, sir.

Q How long had you lived at this address on Gainsboro in East Cleveland?

A I don't know exactly. Approximately two years.

Q Have you lived in and around Cuyahoga County all your life?

A No, sir.

Q Are you originally a native Ohioan?

A Yes, sir. I was born in Cleveland.

Q May I ask where in Cleveland? East, West Side?

A No. The East Side, I know that. I believe we were living on Olive Court at the time.

Q That is off of 105th Street, is that right?

A That's right.

Q Now, you are associated with the Oliver Corporation, and they manufacture some tractor equipment, is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Where is the Oliver Corporation located?

A The Cleveland plant is located at 193rd and Euclid Avenue.

Q Is that right on Euclid Avenue?

A It is on Euclid, yes, sir, on the corner.

Q Now, as general foreman of this organization at the present time, can you tell me whether or not you have any business dealings with a company known as the DiNoc Company?

A No, sir, not that I know of. I don't personally know.

Q Have you ever come in contact with a Thomas Reese, who is associated with the DiNoc Company?

A No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Q Do you know the man?

A No, sir.

Q Do you know any person that is associated with the DiNoc Company?

A No, sir. I never heard that name before.

Q You stated to Judge Blythin that from the 4th of July on, or the 5th of July on, up until the time that you were officially notified that you were called as a prospective alternate juror in this case, that you had some brief discussions with various people?

A Yes, sir.

Q About how many people are you the general foreman over at the Oliver Corporation?

A I would say approximately about 40, 45.

Q And has some of the discussion that you make reference to been had with those people?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are those persons that you come in general contact with every day?

A Yes, sir.

Q That is, every working day?

A That's right.

Q Now, during those discussions were there some opinions expressed to you by some of your fellow-workers or workers that are under your supervision?

A Yes, sir.

Q And about how many of the 40 would you say that you had this brief discussion with expressed an opinion to you?

A I couldn't answer that honestly. I'd say maybe 10 percent, roughly.

Q That would be about four or five?

A Four or five.

Q About over a period of how many days from the time that this case was first written up in the newspaper until that time that you were personally notified to come down and qualify as a prospective juror would you say that an opinion was expressed to you in the plant?

A I don't know. Numerous times.

Q Many times?

A Yes, I would say so.

Q Was there any other opinions expressed to you outside of the

plant in your social gatherings? ✓

A Yes, sir. ✓

Q Are you a member of any organizations, that is, social clubs?

A Yes. ✓

Q May I have the names of them, please?

A The Moreland Hills Village Association; National Association of Foremen; Foremen's Club of Greater Cleveland; Orange School Booster Club. That's about all, I guess. ✓

Q At these many organizations there was discussions about Sam Sheppard? ✓

A I would say very, very little. ✓

Q But there was some? ✓

A I imagine so, yes. I don't recall.

Q Was there some discussion about Sam Sheppard's family? ✓

A Not that I recall. There could have been.

Q Now, about how often or how many times would you say an opinion was expressed to you at these different gatherings that you attended? ✓

A I don't know. I imagine three, four times. It was very slight.

Q And did you at any time express some ideas that you may have had as a result of the newspaper articles? ✓

A I possibly have, yes.

Q Did you come into the courtroom this morning with any of those ideas that you may have expressed?

A No, sir. I came in here with an open mind.

Q With the thought of only fair play in your mind?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, getting back to the opinions that were stated to you by some of the people that work under you or work with you, do you have now in your mind a recollection of what those opinions were and by whom they were stated?

THE COURT: Answer that yes or no.

PROS. JUROR HANSON: Can I answer it another way?

THE COURT: You are not to state what anybody's opinion was.

MR. GARMONE: I don't want the opinion.

PROS. JUROR HANSON: Yes, I understand you. You want --

THE COURT: You can answer it otherwise, but do not state what any opinion was that was expressed, if any.

A I understand. Possibly some of them I can remember who they were and what they had said. Not all of them, I wouldn't say, no.

Q Well, now, if you are chosen as an alternate juror in this matter, and you eventually were placed into the jury box where you would have the right to express your vote, that is, replace one of the other jurors who may somewhere along

the line become ill or through something that we can't contemplate not be able to continue on, would those opinions, do you think, creep back into your subconscious mind as you were listening to the facts that would be given to you by witnesses that would occupy the same chair that you are in?

A No, sir, they would not.

147 Q You wouldn't permit yourself to weave any of those facts in the facts that you hear in this courtroom?

A No, sir.

Q You are satisfied to that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, has there been any discussion around your home about Sam Sheppard, or any other member of the Sheppard family?

A The normal amount, yes.

Q Was there some opinions expressed by Mrs. Hanson or by your mother-in-law?

A Yes, I imagine. Not a definite opinion, no. Expressions, yes.

Q Well, I won't ask you what your mother-in-law's opinion was.

A I wouldn't believe it anyhow.

Q You could dismiss whatever she thinks of the matter and just treat this case on the facts that you hear here?

A I usually do.

Q You are one of the believers in the old theory of mothers-in-law, is that it?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, Mrs. Hanson, has she ever expressed an opinion to you?

A Yes.

Q And you wouldn't permit her opinion to play any part in this case, would you?

A No, sir.

Q Now, when we talk about facts, we have in mind only the statements that you will hear from witnesses who will testify in this courtroom, and do you now say, Mr. Hanson, that you can judge this matter only on the statements that you will hear in this courtroom?

A Yes, sir.

Q By competent witnesses?

A Yes, sir.

Q I will come back in a minute or two on the question of facts and what your duties as a juror will be in relation to facts.

The Court stated to you that there had been an indictment returned by the Grand Jury of this County against Sam Sheppard charging him with murder in the first degree, and I think that you did answer that the mere fact that the indictment has been returned does not raise any presumption of guilt in your mind as to Sam Sheppard, is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, along those lines, the Court will instruct you eventually on the law, and he will say to you, and he will

say to all these other ladies and gentlemen, that you at no time are to consider the indictment, though you may take it to your jury room with you, as evidence in this case. Will you follow that theory of law?

A Yes, sir, I will.

Q The Court will say to you as a matter of law, and I will ask you now if you subscribe to it, that the purpose of an indictment is only to apprise this young man what he must stand trial for, that when the statements are given to the Grand Jury, when the evidence is submitted to the Grand Jury that brought about this indictment, only those witnesses that the State of Ohio deemed necessary were called upon to testify. Sam Sheppard wasn't asked to go before that body and give his side of the issue. Sam Sheppard wasn't permitted to take before that body any of his witnesses, so it became, in the parlance of law, an ex-parte hearing, known to you and I as laymen as a one-sided affair, and it is because of that, Judge Blythin will say, that under no circumstances whatsoever at any time are you to consider that indictment as evidence in this case, and you do subscribe to that theory of law, do you not?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q Now, the indictment sets out the allegations that constitute first degree murder. They state in the indictment that this defendant unlawfully, purposely and of deliberate and

premeditated malice killed his wife, Marilyn Sheppard. Under our construction of fair play, and under our construction of the system of government that we now enjoy, his Honor will say to you, Mr. Hanson, that it is incumbent on Mr. Mahon, Mr. Danaceau and Mr. Parrino to prove each and every one of those elements that I just finished stating to you, to the point where they convince you beyond a reasonable doubt. That will be his instructions to you. You will follow those instructions?

A Yes, sir.

Q And he will add thereto, in line with that thought, that should they fail to satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt that each and every one of those essential things that I have read off to you, that it would be your duty as a juror then to return a verdict of not guilty. Would you hesitate, if you were so instructed?

A No, sir.

Q He will say to you, Mr. Hanson, and he will say it to all these other ladies and gentlemen, that even though they prove one, two or three of those elements or things, that that in and of itself is not sufficient, should they fail to prove the fourth element to the point where you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt, and it would then be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty. Do you subscribe to that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, in the thought that I have just expressed to you, I made mention that it was incumbent upon the State of Ohio to satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt. It is our law that that burden never changes, it never shifts, it remains throughout this entire trial with the State of Ohio, and the Court will so say that that is the law. You have no notions of your own about that, do you?

A No, sir. I will be guided by the Judge.

Q There was some mention made by Mr. Parrino that you may be asked to consider two types of evidence, direct and circumstantial evidence. His statement was correct, and he did say to you, and rightfully so, that the Court will instruct you that both types of evidence are proper and should be dealt with in the proper manner.

The Court, however, Mr. Hanson, will state to you that when reliance for conviction is placed on circumstantial evidence, the facts and circumstances upon which the theory of guilt is placed must be shown beyond a reasonable doubt, and when taken together, when you consider all these facts that go to make up this circumstantial chain, the links, when taken together, must be so convincing as to be inconsistent with the claim of innocence and admit to no other answer, that is, all those facts, all those links that describe this picture in a circumstantial manner admit

to no other answer than the guilt of the accused. His Honor, Judge Blythin, will tell you that that is the rule that you are to follow governing the circumstantial evidence phase of this case. Will you follow that rule?

A I will be guided by the Judge, yes, sir, whatever he instructs.

Q Now, we did stress somewhat on the thoughts that were called to your attention because of the wide publicity that this case has received in the newspapers, radio broadcasts and television pictures. You won't permit yourself to come to any conclusion on anything that you may have read, heard or seen, will you?

A No, sir.

Q Because you know newspapers, they sometimes take a statement of fact and they give it their own interpretation -- that is their business, and they are entitled to their business -- but you won't permit any interpretation that they give to an issue to creep into the fair play that this young man is entitled to, will you?

A No, sir.

Q You said that you were connected with the Moreland Hills Association?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that part of the government operation of that village?

A No, sir. It is anti-political.

Q Does it bring you in contact with any members of the police department?

A Well, yes and no. The police department -- the police are probably members of the Association, and the Association has at times asked the police department to stuff mail boxes or handbills or notices, or something like that, but that would be the extent of it.

Q Well, during some of the meetings that the Association held, was there ever any time that maybe one of the police officers who work in cooperation with the members of the Association had expressed an opinion to you?

A No, sir.

Q You will be called upon to consider in this case testimony of police officers who are connected with the police department of the City of Cleveland, and I believe -- or we anticipate officers who are connected with the police department of Bay Village.

Now, would the fact that this Association that you are active in cause you to give the testimony of a police officer more consideration than you would a layman because of the fact that he is a police officer?

A No, sir.

Q Can I assume that you would treat both with the same yardstick?

A Yes, sir.

Q And measure their testimony in accordance with the instructions on the law that the Court will tell you is applicable to that phase of the issue?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are there any members of your family who are connected with the medical -- who have a medical degree or are connected with any doctors?

A No, sir.

Q In this Association, or some of these other clubs that you belong to, are some of those members medical doctors, to the best of your recollection?

A No, sir, -- well, there might be some members in some of them, but I don't know.

Q Well, now, if chosen as a juror, eventually, and you were called upon to listen to the testimony of a person who is a doctor in the medical field as against a person who is a doctor of osteopathy, would you, because of the fact that one was connected with the medical field give him more consideration than you would the osteopathic physician?

A No, sir.

Q You would use the guidance of fair play in weighing the worth of their testimony, is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Dr. Gerber, Dr. Adelson, Dr. Sunshine, Dr. Chamberlain, and a young lady who is identified as Mary Cowan, are

associated with the County Coroner's office. Do you know any of those people directly or indirectly?

A No, sir.

Q Would you, if you were called upon to listen to them as witnesses, because of their connection with the Coroner's office, give their testimony greater consideration than you would doctors who were not connected with the Coroner's office?

A No, sir.

Q Mr. Hansen, in some of the articles that you were frank, and we appreciate it, in telling us about, that you read in the newspapers, do you recall the one that had to do with Susan Hayes? ✓

A Yes, sir.

Q In that article, or articles that dealt with that young lady, there was a statement attributed to her that was publicized by all the papers, that she had on occasions been intimate with Sam Sheppard. Do you recall that? ✓

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, having knowledge of that, did it create or would it create in your mind any ill-will toward this young man?

A No, sir.

Q Would it give you an idea, a preconceived idea of what your judgment in this case should be?

A No, sir.

Q And you wouldn't permit any outside people who may have knowledge of her statement, permit their feelings to creep into the thought that you have just expressed here, would you?

A No, sir, I would not.

Q Now, Mr. Hansen, I could probably go on and ask a good many questions of you and through the examination never bring out the fact of some thought that you may have in your mind why you feel you would want to be relieved of the responsibility, so I will ask you now to search your conscience, and search it very carefully, and I ask you to do this because, if you should qualify as an alternate juror and eventually take into this box the authority that goes with a juror, you shall take with you the responsibility, and you probably will never equal it again in your lifetime, the determination of the guilt or innocence of Dr. Sam Sheppard. More reaching than that, you will take with you a power that will give you the right to destroy the life of a fellow-human being.

149 Now, having that knowledge, knowing the great responsibility that will be yours, do you know of any reason or reasons that you can't deal with this young man fairly, impartially, and give him the same kind of a trial that you would want if the positions were reversed?

A No, sir, I know no reason why.

MR. GARMONE: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: The next peremptory is
with the State, gentlemen.

MR. MAHON: The State is satisfied
with this juror, your Honor.

MR. CORRIGAN: We accept the juror. ✓

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen
of the jury, and Mr. Hanson, we will now have a
few minutes' recess, and will you be careful to
observe the caution which the Court has expressed
to you:

Do not discuss this case at all, not even
among yourselves.

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)