

March 26, 2020

Daniel Barer

Los Angeles, California

Re: Perroni v. McDonell

Dear Daniel:

I hope you are doing well under our most trying times as a nation.

Last night I finished Suzanne Finstad's newly released tome entitled *Natalie Wood: The Complete Biography*. The first 448 pages are nothing but a repeat of her first book *Natasha*, but the last 36 pages purports to be a recounting of her efforts to provide an explanation for Natalie's death and the witnesses and material she relied upon to now believe Natalie's death was not an accident. Finstad has consistently identified many of the sources for her conclusions/theories in her Notes appendix.

Part of her information, according to Finstad comes from conversations, emails and text messages with Detective Hernandez, Detective Lowe and LAPD Detective Louis "Sweet Lou" Danoff between 2011 and 2019. Those official contacts resulted in Finstad being given what she calls a "murder book" on Natalie Wood's death. She explains that Danoff gave her "one or two boxes" of investigative material to look through unsupervised. She also says she and Hernandez discussed the contents of certain autopsy photographs. I'm attaching copies of Finstad's statements and references for your ready reference.

Finally, Finstad says a former Coroner's Office employee, Vidal Herrera, and Dr. Michael Franco, a former intern for the Coroner's office, described the content of some of Natalie's autopsy photographs for her. Those claims are also attached. This disclosure was also concealed from the court.

While you may not recall, in your trial brief you attached a declaration of Hernandez that stated in paragraphs 6-9 that he, among other things, knew exactly

what Finstad was allowed to see. He was also deposed on November 8, 2016. Here is the exchange:

“Perroni: Did you mean to state under oath in paragraph 7 of that declaration that the items referred to in that paragraph are the only things that Suzanne Finstad was given access to?”

Hernandez: They are the only things that she said she was given access to.”

The import of all of this is most disturbing. It now looks like your client Hernandez may have committed blatant perjury in an effort to cover-up his and the department’s selective disclosures of public records. Remember, Judge Chalfant said if Finstad was given the entire file to look through, “the whole file is disclosable.” And “one to two boxes” looks to me like it was a file.

Moreover, it also appears that the Coroner’s Office representative may have given a fraudulent declaration by his statements in paragraph 6.

Daniel, while we clashed on a few occasions during our litigation together, I came away from the cases believing that you wanted to do what was right instead of merely seeking a win. So, before I file a motion to reopen the case on the basis of fraud and provide the District Attorney with evidence of Hernandez’s possible crimes, I wanted to give you an opportunity to do the right thing and get me what I was entitled to under Judge Chalfant’s rulings and the CPRA.

I look forward to a prompt response to this letter and a resolution short of another trip to the courthouse.

Most Sincerely,
Samuel A. Perroni