1	STATE OF NEW JERSEY COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION
2 3 4 5 6	IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY VOLUME VIII
7 8 9	Thursday, December 21, 1972 Ridgewood, New Jersey.
10 11 12 13	BEFORE: JOHN F. MC CARTHY, JR., Chairman CHARLES L. BERTINI, Commissioner WILFRED P. DIANA, Commissioner
14 15 16 17	APPEARANCES: JOHN J. FRANCIS, ESQ., Special Counsel to Commission, -and- PROPERTY OF
18 19 20	CHARLES D. SAPIENZA, ESQ., Counsel to Commission. AUG 2021 185 W. STATE ST. PO BOX 520 THENTON, NJ 08625-63-13
21 22 23	Reported by: John J. Prout, Jr., C.S.R.
24 25	974.90 I62. 1973 v. 8

ļ	1									
1										
2	<u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u>									
3										
4										
5	VITTONEGO									
6	WITNESS		EXAMINATION							
7	BIFBRE B. CARVEN									
8	PIERRE P. GARVEN Mr. Francis									
9	Mr. I	1301								
10										
11										
12	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE							
13	C-60	Memorandum of Mr. Sapienza re meet-								
14		ing with Judge Stamler, dated September 29, 1972	1343							
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										

Commission of Investigation. Present are all three commissioners; Mr. Bertini, Mr. Diana, my name's John McCarthy. We have special counsel, ac. Francis, and Counsel Mr. Charles Sapienza, and we're here today to take testimony from Judge Pierre Garven relative to the investigation of the Attorney General's Office as regards to the handling of what we call the Sherwin matter.

What we do, Judge Garven, we will ask you to be sworn and then Mr. Sapienza will give you, as we give in all cases, various warnings to all witnesses, and then Justice Francis, or Mr. Francis, will take care of the questioning along with Mr. Sapienza.

All right. Would you stand up, sir, to be sworn.

PIERRE P. GARVEN, having been duly sworn according to law by the Officer, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Pierre P. Garven, 261 Bellair Road, Ridgewood, New Jersey.

MR. SAPIENZA: Mr. Garven, just before we

begin I'm going to read to you the warnings that we read to all witnesses who appear before us.

Your testimony will be taken under oath and transcribed by the shorthand reporter. It may be used against you later on in a court of law. For that reason, if you feel that any of your answers may tend to incriminate you, you may refuse to answer. You have, of course, the right to be accompanied by an attorney of your choice. We know that you are an attorney. But, just for the record, is it your desire today to proceed without any outside counsel to assist you?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

MR. SAPIENZA: If at any time during the questioning you would like us to stop for any reason, you just have to say "Stop" and we will discontinue the proceedings.

You are appearing voluntarily.

Section 52 of our statute requires that any information you may gain from this interview you should hold confidential to yourself, and we will do likewise. This is an executive, private session. The Commission has the right to release your testimony at this private session to the public either

5

in a report or some other fashion at a later time, or even ask you to give the same testimony again at a public hearing if they should decide that's necessary.

You understand that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

at this private hearing may be made available to you and will be made available to you as soon as it is transcribed. Upon reading the same, if you would like to file a sworn, written statement relative to your testimony, we will be glad to accept it and incorporate it into the record. You don't have to do so. It's strictly up to you. That's all.

John, just one point. The last marking we had for exhibits, I think, was C-59 and my notes indicate that was an October 22nd memo from David Biederman to the file. Does that correspond to your recollection?

MR. FRANCIS: Off the record.

(Whereupon, there is a discussion off the record.)

EXAMINATION BY MR. FRANCIS:

Q Well, Judge, you are a member of the Bar of

```
New Jersey?
   1
                             A
                                    Yes, sir.
  2
                      And have been for how long?
  3
              Since approximately 1952.
  4
                      You have an official position in the state
              Q
  5
       government now, do you?
  6
       A
              Yes, sir.
  7
              Q
                     And what is it?
  8
       A
              Counsel to the Governor.
  9
                     And you have had that for how long?
              Q
 10
              Since 1970.
              Q
                     When in 1970 did it begin?
 11
              January. Approximately January 20th, 1970.
       A
 12
 13
                     And did you know Deputy Attorney General
              Q
       David Biederman?
 14
                                                  Do I know him?
 15
              Q
                     Yes.
                                   A
                                          Yes, I do.
16
                     And did you know him in the late fall of
17
      1970?
                                   A
                                          Yes.
                     In November of 1970, do you recall whether
18
             Q
      or not Biederman came to see you at your office at the
19
20
      State House?
                                          Yes. Well, I had
      seen Dave Biederman on a few occasions prior to that time
21
      at meetings, so I did know the man. He did come in the
22
      fall of 1970, if you're referring to this matter that--
23
             Q
                    Yes.
24
                                          A
                                                 --you have under
      investigation.
25
```

```
Well, on or about the 4th of November of
            Q
1
                                               I can't place the
                                  A
                                         Yes.
     1970?
2
     date, but I would say that he did see me at approximately
3
     that time.
4
                   I see. Well, at least you can say in the
            Q
5
     early part of November of that year?
6
            I believe it was, yes.
7
                   And did he have an appointment or did he
8
                                         No, I'm sure he did not
                                  Α
     just come in?
9
     have an appointment; that is, a long-range appointment.
10
     Whether he called up an hour before or whether he came in
11
      I don't know.
12
                    Did you have a conversation with him at that
             Q
13
                                          Yes, I did.
      time?
14
                    About how long did it take?
             Q
15
             I know it was very short.
16
                    When he came in, did he have any documents
             Q
17
                                          Not that I recall.
      with him?
18
                     Did he hand you any documents?
19
             No, he gave me nothing.
      A
20
                     Did he tell you what he came in for?
21
              Yes.
      A
22
                     And what was that?
              Q
23
              He said that the Secretary of State, Paul Sherwin,
24
       had written a letter to, as he put it, his commissioner,
25
```

meaning Commissioner Kohl, requesting the commissioner to rebid a project. I am sure that he identified the project, but I couldn't tell you, you know, how he did it.

I also believe that Biederman advised me of the reasons why Sherwin requested the bids to be resubmitted.

I'm not sure about this, but I think that he did. I believe he mentioned something about the engineering costs, and I think that he said something about the low bidder's material or lack of material.

Q Did he tell you at that time as to whether or not a decision had been reached by the commissioner to award the contract to the low bidder or somebody else, or to reject all the bids?

A Yes, he told me that Kohl was, or had, I believe, had gone with the lowest bidder and was--had awarded the contract to the lowest bidder.

Q Now, do you have a recollection of the name, if Biederman did use a name, of the low bidder?

A No, I don't.

Q What, if anything, did he say to you about what he wanted you to do?

A Well, he asked me, basically, and I'm giving you now, you know, substance here, to the best of my recollection, anyway, he asked me to speak with Sherwin and advise Sherwin that Commissioner Kohl had determined to go with the lowest

5

and not necessarily he, but, I suppose, Kohl, to speak with Sherwin and to advise Sherwin that Kohl did not want others involved in the Department of Transportation matters, and that I told Biederman that, you know, I would be happy to speak to Paul.

Q And did you call him?

A I have no present recollection of talking to the man, but I'm convinced in my own mind that I did.

Q Did Biederman ask you to tell Sherwin that the contract had been awarded?

A Yes.

A No, I don't--it seems to me there was no question in my mind but that the contract had been awarded to the lowest bidder. And I'm sure of one reason that he was there was the request had been made by Sherwin. Obviously Kohl had reviewed the request, as he would, I assume, anybody else's, and rejected it. But John Kohl is the type of man, as some of us are, that would profer, I think, to have a rejection advised by someone else, and I think tolm has felt--and I'm just giving you my impression of how I felt--John would rather have that conveyed to Paul, plus I think that John also--and again I'm giving you my own impression of how I felt--felt that the involvement, even

by way of a request, whatever the motivation was, by others, mainly Sherwin in this case, probably stepped on his toes, and I suspect those are the reasons that Biederman was there.

Q I don't know whether you said this or whether I asked you. Did Biederman say to you, according to your recollection, that Kohl had asked him to come and see you and ask you to speak to Sherwin?

A Yes, I believe he did.

Q Then you said you have a recollection that you did talk to Sherwin?

A No, I can't tell you the conversation, because I just don't recall it. But I'm convinced that I did speak with Paul and convey that which I just stated.

Q Do you remember what he said?

A This is what troubles me in the sense that I can't put my finger on it. I am relatively certain it wasn't the first day that Biederman was there. It may have been two or three days later, and I just have that sense of feeling that there was nothing that was said by Sherwin that made any impression upon me. This, you know, all occurred in a very short period of time, both conversations Biederman's and, I assume, this one I had with Sherwin.

Q You think the one you had with Sherwin was a day or so later-- A Yes.

Q --after Biederman's visit?

A Yes. I just have some recollection of doing something after Biederman left totally unrelated to Biederman, you know, going on my way, and I don't think it was an appointment, but going back to that which I had done before he got there.

Q Do you-- A Furthermore, the conversation, I must add, did not lend itself to any promptness or need as far as I was concerned based upon the information he gave me.

Q Do you have any recollection of any conversation, specific conversation, you had with him about the low bidder and what you said to him about it?

A With Biederman?

Q Yes. A The only thing
I recall is that he mentioned the request by letter. And
I would like to get back to that letter for a moment,
if I may.

Q Yes, I was going to ask some more about it,

too.

A He said that Kohl had

determined to go with the lowest bidder, and I know I made

some reference to the fact that he legally, and Kohl is

head of the department, certainly had all the facts at

hand and I'm sure that a proper and legal determination

was made, and I know I also made some reference, "I'm

glad to see the dirt fly" or something to that effect.

Q Do you have any recollection as to whether within a short time after that, again in the early part of November, meeting Commission Kohl and saying to him, in not a conversation that was designed to talk about this particularly, but in conversation saying to him, 'Well, I talked to Sherwin and there will be no more interference in your department'?

A I don't recall it. I don't even recall using the word "interference" at any time.

Q I see. A With anyone.

Q Well, leaving out the word "interference,"

do you have any recollection of having spoken to Kohl

and telling him that you had spoken to Sherwin?

A No, I have no recollection of that. It could have happened, because I'm sure I spoke to Paul. Now, whether it did or not I don't recall, but I just don't have any recollection of that.

Q Did Biederman ever speak to you again about it and ask you whether you had spoken to Sherwin?

A I saw Dave Biederman after that time, but I'm

just guessing, ten, twelve times, or maybe more. He never

uttered one word about our conversation or the subject

matter after that one meeting. It was the one meeting,

three minutes or five minutes or whatever it was, and

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

there was not a peep from Dave Biederman to me from that time until this day. The last time I saw Dave Biederman was in March of 1972 on a matter totally unrelated to this.

Yes, I have a note about that. I would like to come to it a little later.

I might add one other thing while I think about that, which is certainly not germane to this, but I know Dave at that time could not have been too disenchanted because--I'm now referring to March of '72--because on his way out, and again it was a short stay, he said that although he was out of the administration, and although he had been a Democrat, I guess, all his life, that he wanted to work for Governor Cahill, if he ran again, as chairman of the Democrats for Cahill. So, I told him that I thought things were a little premature at that time, but thanked him. And I think those are the last words I've said to Dave Biederman.

To come back to the first conversation again in the early part of November, would it be fair to say that when he left you had given him the impression that there would be no suggestions of any kind from you adverse to the award of the contract to the low bidder?

I couldn't care less. My main concern, and only concern, would be in the interest of the State that the lowest bidder get the award. I had no knowledge of Manzo

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

or any of these other fellows at that time. Never heard of them and never heard of Route 46 contract, the one in issue, at that time. I just felt that Dave came in there for the reasons that I had advanced to you.

Now, going back to the papers, in reference to papers again, you have a clear recollection that he did not have with him what he has described as a package which he gave you?

A Well, I can't tell you what he had on his person, obviously. I can tell you one thing positively, categorically, honestly; he gave me nothing.

Now, I did want to make one reference to a letter.

Q Let me-- A I'm sorry.

Q --touch that letter for a moment. At that

time did he have in his hands a sheaf or a number of

papers and clip them to one and say, "This one you ought

to see," and he showed you a letter of October 8th from

Sherwin to Kohl?

A He had nothing

in his hand, as far as I recall. I know he gave me

nothing. The only thing that troubled me, and you have

to put these things in a context, was whether he showed

that letter.

Q You're talking about the October 8th letter?

A I'm now talking about the Sherwin to Kohl, the only

--the only document that we discussed. I thought about

that, you know, the last few months and I could not in the beginning really think whether he had a copy of that or not, if he showed it to me. But I am absolutely convinced now that he did not. He mentioned the letter. There is no question about that. Obviously that was his initial remarks.

A That there was a request, yes, for--Sherwin had requested by letter that this contract be rebid, and, as I said before, I believe Dave also gave me reasons, which I assume would be Sherwin's reasons.

Q Do you want to say in the--

A Several months ago--

Q Oh, I was going to say, do you want to say anything more about that letter?

A I just--that was the only thing that really bothered me in the sense that I couldn't put my finger on it. But I am now totally convinced that he made mention of the letter. He did not have the letter with him, at least.

Marked C-5 in our hearings. Suppose you look at it to see if it does anything to indicate that he may have shown that to you.

A Well, I think this is one of the reasons why I say he did not, because

my mind may not be the best, and obviously it is not, but--

Q At the moment you mean?

A No, at any time.

But I do feel confident that I would recognize at least some of the wording in a letter of this nature, and when I did read it maybe four or five months ago, whenever it was, it just didn't ring that spark of having seen it.

Q Well, looking at it now--

A And looking at it now--

Q --you're satisfied, are you?

A --it just satisfies me completely.

Q Now, to deal with the express statement about it, just a minute ago I asked you whether Biederman showed you some papers and flipped them, quotes, flipped them, as he put it, flipped the package open to this letter and did he say to you then, "Particularly this one," meaning the October 8th letter?

A This one? He didn't show me anything.

Q The reason I ask the question is, I have given you Biederman's quote, and you say that he never said that to you; that he never flipped the package and said to you, "I want you to look at these, particularly this one," meaning that letter?

A This man never had a package to flip when he was in my office on that date in November of 1970.

A Yes, I'm sure I did.

Q On that day in the afternoon were you present in the Governor's office when General Kugler and the Governor were present and Commissioner Kohl was sent for and came in with his file?

A I think, Mr. Justice, I was there; you know, in and out, but I was there part of the time.

Q I see. A I was there
when the Attorney General was there, at least in part, I'm
sure, and also when Commissioner Kohl was there.

Commissioner Kohl produced, which had handwritten on the side of it, "Biederman discussed with Garven 11/4. Garven to speak to Sherwin"? Do you remember seeing that?

A Yes. I'm not sure that was the exact day. Let me rephrase that. I'm not sure of the exact date, but I know that either John Kohl gave me a sheaf of papers, maybe eight or nine. I'm not sure. I don't have them here. I thought I did. But that was one of them.

Q Well, at that time--

A I assumed that was his file, or part of it.

Q At that time, and I'm speaking now about this day in the Governor's office when that paper was produced, was there any conversation then about whether you had spoken to Sherwin and what you had said to him and what

Sherwin's reply was?

A I don't even think at that moment it crossed my mind, but I know I didn't speak of it when John was there. I don't think-- I just don't think it crossed my mind. You know, at that time it just didn't occur to me. I dien't put the two together.

Q Did Kohl at that time, at least, make any statement that you heard indicating what he believed Sherwin was seeking to do with him in connection with this Route 46 contract?

A Well, I know the general subject matter was discussed. I know he had his file there, and I think he had a copy or copies made, maybe one or two, which were these eight or nine sheets, pieces of paper.

- Q Well, maybe-- A I don't--
- Q Did Commissioner Kohl indicate any anger or animosity toward Sherwin at that time?

A I certainly wouldn't characterize it as animosity, no.

Q Well, did Commissioner Kohl make any statement as to whether he believed Sherwin was engaged in any corruption or illegal activity or doing anything that involved the payment of, passage of money?

A No.

Q Or anything of this sort?

A None at all. On the contrary, possibly, as I recall, something about a political favor or something.

Q Commissioner Kohl said something about doing-

Q --a political favor?

Something like that.

A Yes.

A

Q You were there when the Secretary of State
Sherwin came in, were you? Or in and out, as you say?

A Again, like many meetings, I'm in and out between
the Governor's office and my office. But I was there at
certainly part of the time that the Secretary of State
came in, yes.

Incidentally, John Kohl was not there as I recall, when the Secretary of State was there.

Q In other words,--

A I think the Governor brought him in.

Q They came in at separate times?

A Independently.

Q By the way, did the Governor or General

Kugler at any time while you were there say either to

Sherwin or to Kohl what the reason was for his inquiries

that afternoon?

A I think the

Attorney General had said that he had had a conference

with the U. S. Attorney, as a result of which the Attorney

General saw the Governor and advised the Governor of the

2,

substance of that conference.

Attorney General, to either Sherwin or Kohl, or to both,
as to what their attitude should be toward any investigation?

A Well, I know the Governor did as to each.

Q What did he say?

A He told each that he wanted that individual to cooperate to the fullest extent with the law enforcement agencies, whatever they may be, federal or state.

anything, Sherwin said in reference to his participation in this matter?

A As I recall,
Sherwin was very vague about it and didn't really remember the transaction, except I think he did make some reference to asphalt in general. He said he had a file and that there would be some material in the file. When I speak of asphalt in general, I meant the lack of it at that time. And he went back to his office to try and get a file that would convey some of these things.

Q Well, did he make any explanation of that October 8th letter and why he wrote it?

A I believe that Sherwin at that time didn't even recall writing it.

Q Well, do you have any recollection as to

whether when Kohl produced this file he showed it to him?
A Showed it to--

Q Oh, well, -- A I don't think-they were not there together.

Q Right, you said they were not there. But did Kohl leave his papers there when he left?

A I'm sure he did, yes. Yes, because at least I know I had this half-dozen or so pieces.

Q Well, do you remember whether anyone showed Sherwin that October 8th letter and asked for an explanation of it?

A I'm sure somebody must have.

Q Do you remember what anybody said or what he said?

A I'm sure somebody asked him if he wrote it, but I just think his response, seems to me, was very vague; that he just didn't recall at that time. I mean, I'm not sure. I honestly am not sure.

that?

A I had what I believe to be that one conversation with Paul Sherwin, which was a couple of days, whatever it was, after November, 1970 meeting with Biederman. I never spoke to Paul Sherwin after that about that subject matter until the subject matter came up in the spring of '72.

Q I see. Well, at any time after the indictment,

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	-
11	
12	-
13	-
14	-
15	
16	** (Spreading Court and a court
17	A PERSONAL CONTRACTOR
18	
19	
20	,
21	
22	,
23	•
24	+
25	5

for example, or after you learned that the United States

Attorney was investigating it, did you ever have conversations with Sherwin about it; say, "What's going on here?"

or anything like that?

A Did I

ever speak with Paul?

Q Yes. A Oh, yes.

Q What did he say about it?

A About what?

Q About what he had done and what he was trying to do with respect to having these bids rejected.

A Well, Paul had always asserted that what he felt he did had justification; that he has always asserted his innocence. He always expressed to me that he never intentionally, intentionally, did anything wrong.

Q Was there ever any discussion between you and Sherwin with respect to his knowledge of a contribution to the Republican Party?

A I don't recall speaking to Faul about any contribution except that I have heard him say that he knew nothing about any contribution, you know, at the time of this transaction, and I have heard him say that, you know, a number of times.

Q I think you told us before that the next time
you ever had any contact with Biederman was in March of
1972?

A No. sir. I had a number

4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Q Any conversation?

The last.

The last? Q A My last conversation was with Biederman in March of 1972.

And do you have a recollection of when he left the Attorney General's Office and the Department of Transportation? Α Yes. I believe he left in the fall of '71.

See, Dave Biederman, as you gentlemen undoubtedly know, is a prolific writer. And that is not being critical, I'm just stating that. He also is one who loves to furnish copies to various people. I must have tens of copies of documents in the file in the office over which I had absolutely nothing to do, but I received copies from Dave Biederman. It surprised me in this case there wasn't one document that had my name on it. But--

Q Between the time he left--our record shows the date of actual leaving as November of 1971. Before he left did you ever have any conversation with him with respect to becoming a judge?

See, my mind--I had lost the track.

Yes, I had a number of conversations with Dave, ten, twelve over the last year or so, on transportation But intermingled with that was his absolute desire

to be a judge, and in one of my functions I do make some 1 suggestions to the Governor, along with hundreds of other 2 people, I'm sure, as far as judgeships are concerned, and, 3 so, Dave continually requested that he be considered. Assin 4 without going into the personalities or reasons, which are 5 really irrelevant here--6 May I ask here at this point, did he ever 7 seek appointment for a specific vacancy from you? 8 Yes, the vacancies in Bergen County. Α 9 And do you remember what court that was? Q 10 Well, I think it varied. Initially, I believe, there 11 was an opening in more than one court. In--12 Well, let's see if I can spur your recollec-13 tion a little bit about this. 14 When Mr. Biederman testified and I asked him 15 with respect to his seeking a judgeship in Bergen County, 16 he said, "Yes. That's the one that went to Mr. Gelman, 17 Judge Garven's partner." Do you recall that judgeship? 18 I certainly do, but I think it goes back before that. 19 You were on the county bench for how long? Q 20 Oh, a little less than a year. 21 This is George Gelman, is it? Q 22 Yes. 23 Was he your partner at one time? Q 24

Oh, yes.

25

	Q	How	long	before	you	went	on	the	bench?
A.	Seven	years	, abo	out,					

Q And-- A But there was absolutely no comparison between a George Gelman and a Dave Biederman, and I'm only expressing my own personal opinion. But I--

More than one vacancy. As a matter of fact, my own. But after that I recall there was one or two, and earlier this year the Governor signed a bill which was passed last year, 1971, creating additional state-wide judgeships that Biederman obviously knew something would go to Bergen County. So it had--there is no relationship between Dave Biederman not receiving at least my recommendation, whatever that may be worth, and George Gelman getting a judge-ship.

Q Well, I gather what you're saying is that
the fact that George Gelman had been your partner at one
time was not the motivating factor in his appointment to
the bench?

A Absolutely not.

Q Now,-- A I might also add this: Aside from judgeship, in 1971, this would be after our November meeting, Dave requested that he be an assistant counsel. There was an opening, or there was going to be an opening. I believe this would be the spring of '71.

Q That was before he left the Department of

A I would like to go back on the subject matter of the confidence.

Q All right, go ahead.

A And not in reference to myself.

I have stated that in our office we receive all kinds of letters from Dave Biederman, and have since I've been there. I'm sure you have a copy of this letter, but it's dated December 29th, 1971. It's in reference to Trap Rock.

Q Oh, yes. We have marked that in evidence.

A Okay. And I would just like to make reference to,

as far as conversation is concerned, Biederman's statement

here in regard to the Attorney General and what a high

regard he has for the Attorney General.

Also, the point shouldn't be missed that this copy that I have, one of several, unrelated, which show blind copy to me, again making reference to all these documents that Biederman allegedly gave me, it seems to me his past performance was always to send me copies with either a copy shown on there or at least blind copy.

Q When he talked with you on that occasion about Mal-Bros., did you know at that time that there had been an application for the reinstatement of Mal-Bros. as a bidder?

A I think, sir, that I had very little to do with the detail of that case. I think

A Oh, yes, on occasion.

Q And how soon after that meeting would you say you had the next discussion with him about it?

A I couldn't tell you when, sir.

Q Did the Attorney General ever indicate to
you that he had any knowledge of any contribution to the
Republican Party prior to the time the Judge Stamler
civil case was tried?

A None.

Attorney General which indicated in any way that he had any knowledge that Sherwin knew anything about a tenthousand-dollar contribution to the Republican Party prior to the time of his appearance before the grand jury or shortly before that?

A Not at all. Up to the point of the Stamler case and some point after that, I'm sure that the Attorney General had absolutely no knowledge of any contribution or anything else.

MR. FRANCIS: I think, gentlemen, that's all I want to ask.

Off the record for a minute.

(Whereupon, there is a discussion off the record.)

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. FRANCIS:

Q We are taking your testimony at your home?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you have been ill for some period?

A About five, six--five weeks, about.

Q And I gather you learned to your complete dissatisfaction today that you have some hepatitis?

A Yes, that is correct, superimposed upon that which I know I already have.

Q And I probably ought to say for the comfort of everybody here that you do not have the infectious kind of hepatitis, the contageous kind of hepatitis.

And I guess we ought to put on the record, too, you're feeling that you're getting better?

A I hope so. Thank you.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, I don't have any more.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bertini?

COMMISSIONER BERTINI: I have no questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diana?

COMMISSIONER DIANA: No questions.

EXAMINATION BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q I just wondered, Judge, I would like to go back to your short meeting with Mr. Biederman. Did you use words to the extent that the contract should go to the low bidder, if that were the case? I mean, did you give him

aspects at all.

think, Mr. McCarthy, as I recall that conversation, that was an accomplished fact. My impression is that he was telling me that Kohl had made up his mind and was going with the lowest bidder. So, I made some reference to him, as I recall, "Fine. You're a lawyer, Kohl's in the Transportation Department; proper, legal." And I know I made some casual reference to the dist flying.

Q Now, did he indicate to you in any way, if you can recall— A I might make—

Q Go ahead. A I might make one thing that comes to mind prior to that time, and this was probably the reason for my remark. There had not been too much contracts coming out of, you know, the Transportation Department. There were a lot of people running around, but there wasn't very much pavement being placed, and, so, any time that a contract could go out and the work start, it was a good day.

Q Did he ever indicate to you, Judge Garven, that in his opinion Mr. Sherwin's actions involving contacting Commissioner Kohl was the same as a conspiracy to violate the bidding statutes, in his opinion?

A He never mentioned anything about conspiracy. He never mentioned anything about his concern for criminal

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did you get the impression--

A Never even thought of it.

Q Did you get the impression that his visit to your office was to counteract any influence that Mr. Sherwin might have over Commissioner Kohl?

A On that one?

Q As far as the award.

No, I can't imagine that. I think what basically, if you use influence, I don't know whether he'd want to see me or not. But, as I expressed, the impression I received was that the contract was going to be awarded to the lowest bidder, whatever the name is; Sherwin had made a request for rebidding and Kohl rejected, as simple as that. Kohl apparently was somewhat hesitant to go back and pick up the phone. That's all he had to do was pick up the phone and call Sherwin the lowest bidder's going to get it. That's it. But he didn't. Now, that, plus again my own impression is that John felt that Sherwin was getting involved in the Transportation Department, and like any other department head, I suppose, he didn't like it. And I think by coming to me -- I don't like to see friction between department heads if they can be avoided, and sometimes communication is the greatest thing. It can eliminate it.

Q So, in essence, his visit to you, really,

was to make sure that Mr. Sherwin didn't have any influence over Commissioner Kohl's department and that you would talk to him about it, so to speak?

A Well, I certainly--I suppose talk does, in a sense, generate some influence. I don't know. It's hard to answer your question specifically.

Q Well, really, what I'm driving at, I'm trying to ascertain to the best of your recollection why you
believed Mr. Biederman visited your office on November
4th, 1970, if that was the exact date.

A Well, for those reasons, yes.

Q Did he ever mention in that conversation that he was going to see Mr. Petrella but he thought he'd see you instead?

A He never mentioned Petrella's name.

Q And you don't recall whether or not he had a prior appointment on this date?

A With me? I'm sure he didn't.

Q Do you know about what time of day the short conversation took place?

A No. I guess, if I was to guess, it would be in the afternoon.

Q Can you turn your attention, Judge, to April 26th, 1972, when the meeting took place in the Governor's office, of two meetings took place. We'll call the first

meeting. I believe it was with Commissioner Kohl?
A There were probably three.

Q Well,-- A The Attorney General and the Governor.

A Again, I think, in and out. And Kohl, and then Sherwin, as I recall the order.

Were you in on that meeting?

Q All right. Can you recall any of the conversations that the Attorney General had either to the Governor and you at the first meeting or the Attorney General's conversation at the second meeting, or at the third meeting relative to his knowledge as to the correspondence that Biederman was supposed to have left with Mr. Van Jahos?

THE WITNESS: Can you read that back?

(Whereupon, the pending question is read by the reporter.)

A Had none. As I recall at that time--now, we're going back to--

Q April 26th, '72.

A --April of '72. The only knowledge that the

Attorney General had concerning anything relating to Manzo,
anything relating to Manzo, was some conspiracy allegation
that Manzo himself made that I believe the Attorney General
had assigned Dave Biederman to look into. But other than

that, he had no knowledge of anything relating to this.

the meetings did the Attorney General indicate to you what the substance of this conference was with Mr. Stern and Mr. Jonathan Goldstein from the U. S. Attorney's Office?

A What I do recall is that the Attorney General said that they met; he was unaware of the subject matter of the meeting until it took place; that the U. S. Attorney had certain documents and put documents before him and asked him if he had any knowledge of this one or if he had been investigating this document or that document.

Q But did he indicate what those documents

pertained to? A I am not sure,

but I think it was a mixture of that which I made reference

to, this conspiracy matter and, also, the so-called Sherwin

matter. I think it was a combination.

Q And these are all relating to memos or correspondence in which David Biederman had become involved?

A Well, I guess had become involved in the sense that, gave it to the people.

Q Can you tell us anything more the Attorney General indicated at those meetings?

A In reference to what?

Q Whether or not he--what I'm really trying to ascertain is what he transmitted to those at the meeting

relative to what he learned via his conference with the

U. S. Attorney Stern and Assistant U. S. Attorney Mr.

Goldstein. A What U. S. Attorney

had stated to the Attorney General?

Q Yes. A Of what he had learned?

I assume what he had learned was in the documents. I believe it was Biederman that gave the documents to U.S.

Attorney's Office.

Q Right. A Among the documents there must have been this letter that we discussed.

Q October the 8th?

A October the 8th.

I assume that there were other memos that were handed to the Attorney General or, at least, submitted to him for a very fast review and then retrieved. I couldn't tell you the documents.

Q No, I don't particularly need the list of the documents. What I'm really trying to ascertain, Judge Garven, is, what did the Attorney General say? You know, what was the purpose of the meeting in the Governor's Office? I mean, why were you all there?

A To bring to the Governor the information that he had received from the U.S. Attorney's Office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Naybe hr. Sapienza can bring

you--

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

MR. SAPIENZA: At the time--

THE WITNESS: Can we have a couple of minutes?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

(Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)

(After recess.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't you read that last question.

(Whereupon, the pending question by the Chairman is read by the reporter.)

Q Naybe to reward that last question, Judge Garven, can you recall what General Mugler said at the start of the conference in the Governor's office as to what Mr. Stern had conveyed to him?

Trenton, I believe, with an assistant whose name comapes me at this moment; met; the Attorney General did not know the subject matter of the meeting metil U.S. Attorney was there, at which point in time the U.S. Attorney submitted to the Attorney General certain documents. I believe the Attorney General said that those documents were furnished to the U.S. Attorney's Office by Biederman, but I'm not sure of that. In any event, the Attorney General said he reviewed them swiftly in the presence of the U.S.

Attorney and his assistant, and there was at least one paper in reference to a Manzo conspiracy contract—I'm sorry—a Manzo conspiracy allegation that rang a bell as far as the Attorney General was concerned. All the other papers, including a letter from Sherwin to Kohl and others relating to that subject matter, the Attorney General stated he had never seen before.

Q And was this conversation in the Governor's

Office in your presence prior to Commissioner Kohl's meeting and Secretary of State's meeting?

A Yes.

Q When the statement or statements were made by the General?

A Yes, that's correct.

EXAMINATION BY MR. FRANCIS:

have given it? Was the Attorney General any more specific than the way you have given it to us with respect to the Manzo conspiracy allegation? What did it relate to?

A I believe he, the Attorney General, said that it related to a charge made by Manzo that he, Manzo, had been barred, if you will, by the activities of other contractors.

Q Through some centain means:

A Through bid rigging of some kind.

That he had been made aware of this, I believe, in the summer of 1970 and had assigned Biederman to ascertain the information; that Biederman had apparently reported, I gather, the month or two thereafter: that there was no substance to it. This the Attorney General said was the only matter that he himself had any knowledge about while he was in the office at that time concerning Manzo in general.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SAPIENZA:

Q I take it that the Governor must have asked the Attorney General, 'What do you know about this?''

A That's right.

Q And the Attorney General replied to the effect that "This is all new to me except I do recall sometime back in 1970 about Manzo alleging that there was a group of contractors that were rigging bids and I had Mr. Biederman investigate;" is that fair?

A Yes, and I think--yes, that is correct, and I think the Attorney General really as to the Manzo rigging, you know, was not specific in every detail at that moment in time. He did recall it. It was a year or so before or longer.

Q Certainly you don't recall--well, do you recall whether the Attorney General ever indicated to yourself

or to the Governor or anyone else in your presence that he had received a phone call from David Biederman sometime in 1970 in which phone call David Biederman explained to the Attorney General some of the facts and circumstances surrounding the Sherwin matter?

A I don't recall the Attorney General stating that.

Q The Attorney General, thee, never stated that to you, did he? A No. The Attorney General, incidentally, has stated to me, as far as I recall the Attorney General, and I saw him the day that Mr. Stern came in and I certainly had several conversations since concerning, you know, the subject matter, the Attorney General has stated right from the inception that he had absolutely no knowledge of any memos concerning this Sherwin matter which were allegedly given to his office in 1970 until he was shown whatever information that Stern had in April of 1972.

Q Prior to the meetings that you were in and out on between Governor Cabill, the Attorney General and either Mr. Kohl or ht. Shotwin, did you ever discuss with the Attorney General David binderson's visit to you on an about November 4th, 1970?

A We're now talking about that one day?

Q Yes. A This--I think I made reference to it before. I can't homestly say whether I did.

I'm not sure whether the thought even--whether I put the two together at that moment. I know it would not have been in the presence of Kohl or in the presence of Sherwin.

Q Prior to that-- A It's

possible. It's possible that it may have struck me at that

moment. I just don't recall it.

Q Prior to that day, did you ever discuss with the Attorney General David Biederman's visit to you?

A Never.

Q On that day, to the best of your recollection, did you tell the Attorney General that David Biederman had visited you?

A It's impossible for me to give you an absolute on that. I just knew it. Can't recall whether the meeting that I had in November of 1970, which was, you know, a year and a half before, came into my mind when the subject matter was being discussed in April of '72 on that specific date.

EXAMINATION BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q You don't have any recollection of seeing that October 29th, 1970 memo that had the--

A Yes, I do.

Q --inscription on the bottom?

A Yes, I do recall that.

Q But you don't recall adding anything to the

"Biederman did come in to see me about this matter"?

A You know, I could probably think about that forever
and not put my finger on it.

Q You don't recall saying it?

A I know that I saw the memos, at least part of Kohl's file, whatever he had at that moment. I know that that inscription was on a memo. That I do recall seeing. As I said, I had a copy of that. Whether it occurred to me on that day or not, and whether I mentioned it, I just don't know.

Q I show you the one that we have marked C-9, dated October 29th, 1970. Is that the one to which--A Yes, that's-yes, that's the one.

Q Judge, do you recall any conversation in any of these, say, three meetings on April the 26th, 1972 in the Governor's office that indicated there was any passage of money or any other consideration?

A There was none.

Q That particular item?

A No, no reference, no discussion. The subject matter wasn't raised.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything else?

COMMISSIONER DIANA: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything, Judge

Garven, you would like to add to this testimony?

Mr. Francis, do you have any other questions to ask Judge Garven?

MR. FRANCIS: One specific one.

EXAMINATION BY MR. FRANCIS:

Q Did the Attorney General at any time in your presence ever say, referring to this Route 46 contract matter and Mr. Sherwin's involvement in it, that "This was the only time we had"--"we," meaning the administration-"had any trouble with Sherwin and Garven spoke to him about it and stopped it"?

A Never. I just want to reiterate one what I think is a salient point, and that is; George Kugler, to my knowledge, never knew of my conversation with Biederman, and I only had one and that was in November of 1970, until sometime in the spring of '72.

Q Well, the reason--

A And no one else, as far as I know.

Q It may sound odd to have me put that question to you, and in precisely those terms, but I asked it of you because Mr. Stern has said, has testified at our hearings, that at the meeting of April 26th that he had with the Attorney General, while the Attorney General was in the course of looking at those documents he paused and

he said, "This was the only time we had any difficulty"-"we," meaning the administration--"had any difficulty
with Mr. Sherwin and Judge Garven spoke to him and stopped
it," and you say you never heard the Attorney General ever
say, make any such statement as that?

A Never heard him say that.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SAPIENZA:

Q It wouldn't be a true statement if it was said, would it?

A It certainly would not. Again, I go back. I never spoke to George Kugler about this matter of November, 1970 until April of 1972, or May, whatever it was, but 1972.

A Because it seemed to me it had nothing to do, as far as I was concerned, anyway, with the Attorney General himself. After all, the man that was giving me information, however slight it might be, was a deputy attorney general.

EXAMINATION BY FIR. FRANCIS:

Q Let me put a hypothesis to you about
Biederman's visit on November 4th. The record shows that
on November 4th Biederman, at Commissioner Kohl's direction,
sent a memorandum to hullen, the assistant commissioner,
telling him to set the machinery in motion to award the

contract to Centrum, the low bidder, November 4th. The formal document awarding the contract was signed on November 5th, the next day. Biederman came to see you on the 4th, apparently, between the time the decision was made to award to Centrum and the time the formal documents were signed. Did Biederman say anything to give you the impression that he was coming to see you in order to avoid any possible further interference with Sherwin with the signing, formal signing, of the award the next day?

A No, none at all. I made my assumption based on, as I said, on Biederman said that was an accomplished fact. I had nothing to do with contracts and I certainly didn't know anything about this one.

MR. FRANCIS: Well, I guess that's it.

(Whereupon, there is a discussion off the record.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that we have no other questions to ask Judge Garven.

MR. FRANCIS: Off the record.

(Whereupon, there is a discussion off the record.)

THE CHAIRMAN: However, Judge Garven, I would like to point out that the State Commission of Investigation operates, as you are probably aware, under the Code of Fair Procedure, and at the

may file a brief sworn statement for consideration by the Commission. I believe that was touched upon by Mr. Sapienza in his opening warnings, and if you feel that you would like to file a brief sworn statement within the next few days, the Commission will be very glad to accept it.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I thank you, Mr. McCarthy I thank all of you gentlemen for coming here.

MR. FRANCIS: Before you close it, now, may I mark the memorandum of Mr. Sapienza relating to his meeting with Judge Stamler.

COMMISSIONER DIANA: Will that be C-60?

MR. FRANCIS: Dated September 29th, 1972,

C-60.

(Memorandum of Mr. Sapienza re meeting with Judge Stamler, dated September 29, 1972, received and marked Exhibit C-60.)

(Witness excused.)

* *

STATE OF NEW JERSEY COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION	î	
OF THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY	:	CERTIFICATE
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY	:	OF
	.:	REPORTER

I, JOHN J. PROUT, JR., a Certified Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey,
do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and
accurate transcript of my stenographic notes, as taken
by me on the date and at the place hereinbefore set forth.

JOHN J. PROUT, JR., Certified Shorthand Reporter.