

Exploding The Phone

db913

www.explodingthephone.com Bibliographic Cover Sheet

Title	Defendant in Phone Fraud Case Will Appoeal to U.S. Supreme Court
Publication	Los Angeles Times
Date	1965-01-07
V/I/P	p. SG2
Abstract	"A La Puente man convicted of defrauding Pacific Telephone Co. by using an electronic device to place free long-distance calls is going to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court."
Keywords	Brayton Allan Field; Brayton Field (defendant); J. Robert Kotchick (attorney); blue box; Alhambra, CA
Source	ProQuest

The following pages may contain copyrighted material. We believe that our use of this material for non-commercial educational and research purposes constitutes "fair use" under Section 107 of U.S. Copyright Law. If you wish to use this material for purposes that go beyond "fair use," you must obtain permission from the copyright owner, if any. While it will make us slightly sad to do so, we will nonetheless comply with requests from copyright owners who want their material removed from our web site.

Defendant in Phone Fraud Case Will Appeal to U.S. Supreme Court

Los Angeles Times (1886-Current File); Jan 7, 1965; ProQuest Historical Newspapers Los Angeles Times (1881 - 1986) pg. SG2

Defendant in Phone Fraud Case Will Appeal to U.S. Supreme Court

ALHAMBRA - A La verse the conviction on last year with making long-Püente man convicted of de grounds evidence against distance telephone calls, frauding Pacific Telephone Field came from illegal wire using a "tone generator" de-Co. by using an electronic de- tapping. vice to place free long-distance calls is going to appeal on each of 22 counts-and orto the U.S. Supreme Court. Bravton Allan Field, who describes himself as a communications expert. was found guilty last fall by a jury in Alhambra Municipal Court.

His attorney, J. Robert Kotchick, says he will ask stay of sentence for Field. the Supreme Court to re-

Field was fined \$638-\$29 lered to make restitution to the telephone company. Municipal Court Judge Lothrop E. Smith also placed him on 1 year's probation.

The notice of intention to appeal, filed in Municipal Court, resulted in another Field was charged early

vice which permitted him to call without charge.

Kotchick attempted to prove that Pacific Telephone's evidence was inadmissible because it illegally tapped Field's phone line.

Judge Smith, in his instructions to the jury, noted that wire tapping is usually illegal, but that such evidence was admissible in Field's case because " . the telephone company is required to make a record of every call which identifies the calling and the called numbers and the locations . . . "

Lost Appeal

Field appealed to the appellate department of Superior Court, but was turned down.

Also, the appellate court ruled Field could not appeal further in state courts, a power it may exercise under state rules of procedure.

Because of its refusal to permit the case to be appealed on the state level, the U.S. Supreme Court is the only channel open.

Kotchick says he will wait the maximum amount of time allowed before actually filing his appeal with the tribunal to assure thorough research of wire tapping law.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.