rev. 11/25/13

# POLYGRAPHS AND 250 WRONGFUL CONVICTION EXONERATIONS

by Morrison Bonpasse, (morrison@bonpasseexonerationservices.com)

Since the 1989 exoneration of <u>Gary Dotson</u> of his rape conviction in Illinois through DNA testing, over twelve hundred fifty (1,250) people have been exonerated from their wrongful convictions. The best source for information about those cases since 1989 is the newly created (May, 2012) <u>National Registry of Exonerations</u>, a joint project of the University of Michigan and Northwestern University Law Schools. These exonerations have correctly shaken our faith in the ability of the criminal justice system to determine truth. In every one of those cases, the truth, as determined "beyond a reasonable doubt" by a judge or jury, was false.

Since the invention of the polygraph in the early 20th century, its reliability as a detector of truth or lies has been vigorously debated and studied. Given the lack of consensus that polygraph results are reliable, they are permitted to be introduced as evidence of the truth in criminal trials in only one state, New Mexico. However, polygraph results are often considered in related criminal matters, such as Motions for New Trials, and in civil proceedings.

Nonetheless, polygraphs are used extensively by police, lawyers and others in their efforts to determine the truth of people's statements. Faith in the reliability of polygraphs has been enhanced by favorable studies and upon anecdotal evidence where other means have been available to ensure the accuracy of the tested truth. Also, many crimes have been solved by police who announce plans to use polygraphs on witnesses, and the prospect of such a test then sometimes produced a desired confession or changed testimony.

This paper addresses the reliability of polygraphs in predicting the truth which exonerations from wrongful convictions have exposed, before and especially since the advent of DNA testing. Two hundred fifty (250) exonerations were found, primarily on the Internet, where polygraphs were used with defendants/exonerees, suspects or witnesses, before and after the wrongful convictions. Each of the 250 exonerees served an average of 13.4 years in prison for crimes s/he did not commit. For many, their children grew up and/or their parents died during that period, and their returns to society were very difficult. The 250 served at total of 3,342 years in prison. At an average annual cost of incarceration of \$35,000, the cost of just the incarceration was approximately \$117 million. The human and social costs are vastly higher.

Not all of these cases are listed on the National Registry of Exonerations, primarily because the Registry begins for exonerations achieved in 1989, and 35 of the 250 exonerations were before 1989. However, for those not listed, there is sufficient information for classifying them here as exonerations where the innocence of the defendant/exoneree has been affirmed. The 250 cases have been divided into the following six categories where polygraphs of:

1. Exonerees supported innocence.	114	45.6	%
Before trial 51 20.4%			
After trial 63 25.2%			
2. Others supported exoneree innocence.	49	19.6	%
Before trial 25 10.0%			
After trial 24 9.6%			
subtotals		163	65.2%

3. Exonerees had an uncertain result and use.	32	12.8%
Before trial 32 12.8%		
After trial 0 0%		
4. Others had an uncertain result and use.	22	8.8%
Before trial 19 7.6%		
After trial 3 1.2%		
subtotals		54 21.6%
5. Exonerees did not support innocence.	25	10.0%
Before trial 25 10.0%		
After trial 0 0%		
6. Others did not support exoneree innocence.	8	3.2%
Before trial 6 2.4%		
After trial 2 0.8%		

Of the 114 cases where polygraph examinations of defendants/exonerees supported innocence, 51 examinations were conducted before trial. In those cases, the prosecutors did not believe the validity of the results and obtained convictions from juries which almost always did not know of the results of the polygraph tests, because of the rules of evidence in most courts. For 32 other exonerees, all of whose polygraphs were taken before trial, the results were inconclusive or uncertain. It could be argued that even these results should have been considered by prosecutors as pointing away from the exonerees, given the presumption of innocence, and should have given prosecutors pause before proceeding to trial or attempts to obtain guilty pleas. Thus, in 83 (51+32) instances, out of 250, the prosecutors should have paid more attention to the results of the defendants' polygraph examinations before trial. Such additional attention could have meant additional investigation, or a request for a second polygraph exam for the defendant/exoneree, or more polygraphs for witnesses. It also could have meant a considerable reduction in suffering by the wrongly convicted people and their families and friends, as well as getting an earlier start of finding and convicting the real criminals.

For 63 exonerees, the polygraph tests affirming their innocence were administered after their wrongful convictions, almost always in prison. Such tests were often used to help assure investigators reviewing a claim of wrongful conviction that they were on the right track.

In 79 (49+22+8) instances, polygraphs were given to others involved in the wrongful conviction cases, such as witnesses or informants. For 49 of those cases, the results supported innocence. Twenty-five of those 49 were administered before trial, but they were apparently ignored or discounted by prosecutors. In 22 cases the results were mixed or uncertain, and eight did not support the exonerees' innocence. All but one of those 30 (22 + 8) results came from examinations conducted before trial.

Thus, in 163 (114 + 49) or 65.2% of the 250 cases, polygraph results of exonerees and others clearly supported the exonerees' innocence. Of those 163, 76 were before trial and the prosecutors ignored them. In another 54 cases, (32 exonerees + 22 witnesses/others), or 21.6%, the results were mixed, inconclusive or uncertain. Therefore, in 217 (163+54) cases (86.8%) the polygraphs reached a result inconsistent with the certainty of defendants/exonerees' guilt, or, to use the legal terminology, inconsistent with guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

In 25 cases (10%), exonerees failed their polygraph examinations, and all before trial. For the 171 (114 + 32 + 25) polygraphs only of exonerees, 114 passed and 25 failed, for a total of 139 with clear results. If the inconclusive/uncertain results are not considered, i.e. the 32, that gives the odds of 4.6:1 (114:25) or an 82% chance (114/139) of getting a clear correct result for an innocent defendant claiming innocence. If the 32 inconclusives/uncertains are also included, and if the concept is accepted that the only polygraph failure is a clear "deception indicated" failure, the odds of obtaining an acceptable result are 5.8:1 (114+32:25) or 85% (114+32)/(114+25+32).

For this article, the more conservative "clear" probability of 82% is used, but is rounded to 80% for easy recollection and use in other calculations. This rate of accuracy is close to the accuracy rates <u>claimed</u> by the American Polygraph Association (APA). The APA also reports in its <u>Model Policy on Paired Testing</u> that the 2003 National Research Council report, <u>The Polygraph and Lie Detection</u>, found an 86% accuracy rate for polygraphs on single issue testing.

As is described below, there is substantial reason to believe that in many, if not most, of the 25 failed exoneree cases, the polygraphs were defective examinations. In other words, if those exams had been videotaped and administered professionally, according to currently accepted standards, many, if not most, of the defendants/exonerees would have passed their exams. To the extent that is true, the odds and percentage probabilities of obtaining a favorable result, as will be reported in future versions of this article, will improve when each such defective examination is identified.

A significant difficulty in the researching for this article was the quality of the information about the use of polygraphs, when such use was mentioned at all. Without the full records of polygraph examinations, it is very difficult to determine the quality of the actual exams themselves. Were the examiners properly trained? Where the pre-interviews fairly conducted and were the questions objectively prepared? Even when polygraph examinations were properly conducted, it was not always clear that the reporting of the results was accurate. Sometimes, the police would tell a suspect that s/he failed the polygraph in the hope of generating a confession, even when the examination was passed. This is what happened in the Peter Reilly case, described below.

During the research for this article, the actual reports for defendant/exoneree polygraph exams were obtained for only three cases. The first was the one page report of the 1966 examination in New Jersey for Rubin "Hurricane" Carter, and that record is included in the linked files for him and all of the 250 cases at <a href="http://www.bonpasseexonerationservices.com/about.html">http://www.bonpasseexonerationservices.com/about.html</a>. The second was also in New Jersey, for Byron Halsey, noted below, who also was said by the police to have failed his exam. The third was a two page report for Erick Daniels, who passed his polygraph in his North Carolina prison in 2003 at the age of 17 after his 2001 conviction for robbery. Each case is linked separately by name on the linked spreadsheet and sorted by the role of the polygraph. Another linked spreadsheet sorts the 250 cases by state. The spreadsheets are attached to this article. As more cases and more information about each case become known to the author, that information will also be updated and linked, and updated versions of this article will be posted. Also, it is hoped that readers of this article who have direct knowledge of one or more of these cases will forward to the author any information and documents which can contribute to the accuracy of this article. Since the first version of this article was posted on the internet and sent

to several individuals, the number of cases has grown from 166 cases to the current 250, and the accuracy of the categorizations has improved.

As there were multiple polygraph examinations administered in some of the 250 cases, the actual number of polygraph examinations was approximately 300. These 250 cases came from 38 states, plus the Federal Government, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, with the four largest numbers coming from Illinois(29), New York(29), Texas(29), and California(21).

Not included in this article were cases where a polygraph exam played a role, but was not completed. For example, in Illinois, an alternate suspect began to take a polygraph exam in the murder case where <u>Alan Beaman</u> was wrongly convicted in 1995. However, the exam was stopped and canceled due to the suspect's failure to comply with the polygraph examiner's procedural instructions. That non-completion of the polygraph session actually contributed to Beaman's eventual exoneration, but it was a long journey. Because the exam was not completed, it is not included among the 250, because this article is about the accuracy of completed polygraph examinations and not the other implications and uses of polygraphs.

The first known use of a polygraph in a wrongful conviction case was for Jere Snodgrass in 1939 in Michigan. He was accused of passing forged checks and was arrested; the police arranged for a polygraph which he passed. Undeterred, the prosecutors moved ahead with his trial and conviction anyway. He was exonerated when the real robber came forward, after being convicted of other similar crimes. The second use of a polygraph in a wrongful conviction case was in Colorado where Loren Hamby was convicted in 1939 of murdering a gas station attendant during a 1937 robbery. He was sentenced to life in prison, but he insisted that he was innocent. His mother had learned of the newly invented polygraph, and asked one of its co-inventors and prominent proponents, Leonard Keeler, to give Loren a polygraph examination in prison. Keeler traveled from Chicago, so the undertaking was a large commitment. Hamby passed the polygraph exam. As often happens with such results, it wasn't the polygraph by itself, which persuaded the prosecutors and the courts of their mistake. Instead, after a period of time, the results helped persuade the chief prosecution witness to repudiate his testimony, and the repudiation was sufficiently credible to persuade the prosecutors. Hamby was released in 1946 and the Colorado legislature awarded him \$10,000 compensation in 1947.

Of the 250, the first case to reach the U.S. Supreme Court began in California where Paul Imbler sued his prosecutor, Richard Pachtman, for, among other claims, failing to disclose to Imbler's lawyers the results of his polygraph examination. That case made it to the U.S. Supreme Court as <a href="Imbler vs. Pachtman">Imbler vs. Pachtman</a> in 1975. However, the court affirmed the lower courts' dismissal of the case on the grounds of prosecutorial immunity. The Court explicitly noted Imbler's claim "of a lie detector test that had 'cleared' Imbler," but stated later that "but it would have been inadmissible at Imbler's trial and is thus not constitutionally required to be disclosed." Perhaps now, 38 years later, given the polygraph's relative success in determining the truth in exoneration cases, and given the requirement that prosecutors are required to provide to defense attorneys all evidence which might *lead to* evidence admissible in trials, the court would take a different view.

Another exoneree Supreme Court case was <u>Randall Dale Adams v. Texas</u> (<u>448 U.S. 38</u>, <u>1980</u>), but that was about the constitutionality of the death penalty, rather than a challenge to his wrongful conviction. Thus, there was no mention of the polygraph examinations in his case.

Fortunately, Adams' death sentence was vacated, so he was able to live to see his exoneration in 1989.

One case which almost made it to a Supreme Court decision was the case of <a href="Pottawattamine County v. McGhee">Pottawattamine County v. McGhee</a> which involved the issue immunity from prosecution from prosecutorial misconduct in the wrongful convictions of Terry Harrington and Curtis McGhee in Iowa. However, the case was settled in 2009 for \$12 million just before the Supreme Court hearing. McGhee's and Harrington's cases are in the "polygraphs of others" category, below. Coincidentally, a major incentive for settling the case on the prosecutor side of the argument was the risk that Supreme Court would overrule the strict immunity from liability for prosecutors rule from <a href="Imbler vs. Pachtman">Imbler vs. Pachtman</a>.

Examples of each of the categories of the 250 cases are presented below.

# **Category:** Polygraph of exoneree supports exoneree – before conviction

The <u>Peter Reilly</u> case in Connecticut illustrated several uses of polygraphs in police investigations. When his mother was murdered in September, 1973, Reilly was given a polygraph and he passed it. However, the police told him that he failed and used that alleged failure in their successful effort to obtain Reilly's false confession. The 17-year old Reilly reasoned that if a polygraph administered by the police, whom he respected, indicate that he murdered his mother, then he must have done it. This must have happened, he seems to have thought, even if he had no memory of it. Reilly's case fits the sub-category of exonerees passing polygraphs before they were convicted.

In two other cases in this category, defendant/exonerees were told that they failed polygraph examinations that they actually passed. They are tallied here in the "passed before trial" category. After accepting the case of John Kogut of New York, Centurion Ministry's polygraph expert, Charles Honts, concluded that Kogut had passed his three polygraph exams, even though the police told Kogut that he had failed.

Similarly, in New Jersey in 1985, <u>Byron Halsey</u> was told by polygraph examiner Peter Brannon that he failed his polygraph test and he was then wrongly convicted of two murders. Halsey was not exonerated until 2007. Since then, he has sued his polygraph examiner and others and Professor Charles Honts was asked by Halsey's attorneys to evaluate Brannon's polygraph. Honts found the polygraph to be substandard, and wrote in his 2012 <u>letter</u>,

"In summary concerning the CQT [Comparison Question Test] portion of the examination, it is my opinion that there were serious problems with the design and implementation of the Halsey polygraph examination. One of the two comparison questions was at best weak, and was likely inappropriate. The amount of obtained data was less than that required by professional standards. The data that were obtained are inconclusive about Mr. Halsey's credibility when he answered the relevant questions in both series....

... my evaluation of the entire Halsey polygraph examination indicates that Mr. Halsey did not fail either of the comparison question test series and that the CIT [Concealed Information Test] produced a strong truthful result. It is my opinion that rather than failing this polygraph examination Mr. Halsey actually passed the examination and produced a truthful result." (emphasis added here.)

In the California child abuse cases involving husband and wife <u>Scott and Brenda Kniffen</u>, they both passed polygraph tests before their trials. If the accuracy of polygraphs is assumed to

be 80%, as calculated above for clear results (i.e. excluding the inconclusives), and the corresponding risk of incorrect clear result is 20%, then the likelihood of guilt of two people who both claim innocence and who pass polygraph tests is 4.0% (20% x 20%). A similar result applies in the Indiana murder case of <u>Jerry Watkins</u> where he and his wife passed polygraph tests before his trial. She was his alibi witness. A 4.0% likelihood of guilt does not seem close to guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, but the prosecutors sought and obtained their wrongful convictions nonetheless. The same logic applies when two polygraph examinations are given to a person and the result is the same, as was the case for <u>Jerry Pacek</u> in Pennsylvania in 1959. Only 13 years old, Pacek was prosecuted and convicted of murder despite having passed both examinations.

Perhaps the best known example of a private pre-trial polygraph was the exam for <u>Yusef Salaam</u>, who is one of the "Central Park Five." His attorney arranged for the polygraph which Salaam passed, but it was not enough to persuade the prosecutors that they were mistaken, at least with regards to his role. As the book and movie of the same name, "<u>The Central Park Five</u>," show, police and prosecutors also ignored the complete lack of physical evidence linking the "Five" to the assault and rape of the "Central Park jogger."

# **Category:** Polygraph of exoneree supports exoneree – after conviction

The <u>Dotson</u> and <u>Hamby</u> cases, described above, both fit the category where the polygraph results of the exoneree supported innocence, and the sub-category where the polygraph exam was given after conviction.

A more recent case was that of Marty Tankleff, who was convicted of murdering both of his parents in September, 1988, on the first day of his senior year in high school in Belle Terre, New York. His conviction was due primarily to his false confession, which was obtained under duress. After years of failed appeals, he sought the services of private investigator Jay Salpeter, who agreed to work on Marty's case after he passed an in-prison polygraph exam.

Centurion Ministries and the Innocence Project often ask their clients, or prospective clients, to take polygraphs for the same reason. <u>Richard Miles</u>, convicted of murder in Texas, took such a polygraph for the Centurion Ministries investigators. His polygraphist was Eric Holden of Richardson, Texas, who also polygraphed exoneree Rickey Dale Thomas.

The Greg Taylor case in North Carolina was another where an attorney had a client polygraphed during the post-conviction appeal process, in order to ensure that the client was telling the truth. In Taylor's case, he denied any role in the murder for which he was convicted in 1993. What's not included in the tabulated results here is that Taylor volunteered DNA samples and he offered to take a polygraph immediately after he became a suspect, but the offer was declined. If a suspect volunteers for a polygraph, the police should take one or both of two actions. First, by virtue of the offer along, they should reconsider their suspicion of the volunteer and/or their theory about his/her culpability. Second, if they continue to suspect the volunteer then they should give him/her a polygraph exam or arrange to have one conducted by a certified polygraph examiner, with the entire session recorded and the charts made available for Quality Control Review. In the event of such volunteering by defendant/exonerees, it's unconscionable to reject both options and continue to prosecute a suspect.

Before the 1997 murder convictions of <u>Christopher Scott and Claude Simmons</u> in Texas, the actual murderer, Alonzo Hardy, had admitted his role to at least one person. However, Hardy's admissions were not allowed into evidence at the trial. Students at the University of Texas at Arlington Innocence Project took on the case, and Scott and Simmons passed their

polygraph examinations. Then, the students interviewed Hardy, who was in prison for an unrelated conviction, and persuaded him to renew his earlier admission of guilt in the case. Then they persuaded him to take a polygraph test to validate that admission. He also passed his test. This was one of only two cases, of the 250, where the actual perpetrator took a post-conviction polygraph to verify an admission of his own guilt. In the other, also in Texas, Martin Kimsey found the man who had committed the robberies for which he was wrongly convicted. James Garret was already in prison for other robberies and he admitted to the police his role in the 'Kimsey' robbery. Both Garret and Kimsey passed polygraph examinations in support of their claims, and Kimsey was exonerated.

# Category: Polygraph of other person supports exoneree

This category includes two types of results. The first is where another person, often a witness, speaks in support of the exoneree's innocence and <u>passes</u> a polygraph. The second type is where a witness, who is sometimes an inmate informant, provides incriminating information and <u>fails</u> a polygraph.

<u>Ellen Reasonover's</u> exoneration in 1999 from her 1983 murder conviction is an example of the first sub-category. A prison inmate named Eddie McClenton, came forward to state that the real murderer had confessed to him. Centurion Ministries was working on this case and obtained a polygraph confirmation of McClenton's statements.

An example of the second sub-category was in the <u>Sonia Jacobs</u> case, where she was sentenced to death in 1976 in Florida for the murder of a policeman. She did not pull a trigger but was with others, and one of the others did pull the trigger. The only person in the group with gunpowder residue on his clothing was Walter Rhodes, who testified against Jacobs and Jesse Tafero, the father of Jacobs' daughter. The case later unraveled when it was discovered that Rhodes had failed a polygraph exam, but that failure had not been disclosed to Jacobs' and Tafero's attorneys before trial. The prosecutor had justified the plea bargain for Rhodes by falsely affirming that he had passed the polygraph. By the time Jacobs was finally released in 1992, Tafero had been executed. (The mishaps of his bungled electrocution led to the introduction of lethal injection for the Florida death chamber.) If the police had followed the guidance of their own polygraph exam, the wrongful convictions, and the execution of Tafero, would not likely have occurred. Thus, the Jacobs case is in the category where the polygraph examinations of others, i.e. not the exoneree, accurately assessed at least one part of the case, i.e. that the witness pointing to Jacobs, failed the polygraph exam. The case of Sonia Jacobs was one of the seven featured in the play and movie, The Exonerated.

The 1975 cases of <u>Clarence Chance</u> and <u>Benny Powell</u> are also examples of where the polygraph correctly challenged the incriminating witness. Here, the allegations of an incriminating informant were apparently doubted after he failed a polygraph exam. He was therefore given a second exam and he failed that, too. The prosecution withheld from the defense the results of the informant's polygraph failures and Chance and Powell remained in prison until 1992.

#### Category: Polygraph of exoneree with uncertain result

In New York, <u>Jeff Deskovic</u> was polygraphed during his interrogation for murdering a schoolmate girl in 1989. In 1990, Deskovic requested a polygraph to alleviate suspicion which is what many of the wrongly convicted defendants/exonerees did when faced with the charges against them. As with many other cases, the police used the occasion to obtain a false

confession by telling Deskovic that he failed the polygraph polygraph and convincing him that the polygraph was correct. Actually, he seems to have failed only one question during the multiple examinations. Because of that one question, the Deskovic case is classified in the category for exonerees where the results of polygraphs were unclear.

In 2011, polygraph expert Charles Honts evaluated the quality of the Deskovic polygraph in an <u>opinion</u> given in support of Deskovic's civil lawsuit against the polygraph examiner and other defendants for his wrongful conviction. Honts criticized polygraph examiner Daniel Stephens for using the discredited AEP (Arther's Examination Procedure). This procedure was discredited even in 1990. Honts found the use of this procedure odd, as Stephens was trained in the more accurate CQT (Comparison Question Test) methods. Honts concluded,

"Issues of technique validity aside, there were serious problems with the technical aspects of the examination conducted by Mr. Stephens. In total those problems are so out of the range of normal practice for the conduct of a valid polygraph examination as to be considered outrageous and contrary to minimally accepted practice in 1990 and before....

Based upon Stephen's polygraph training and experience by 1990 and the undisputed conditions of the polygraph: at least five hours in length, leaving at least some of the sensors on Mr. Deskovic for an extended period of time, failing to use a valid polygraph technique with numerical scoring, and providing Mr. Deskovic coffee and no food for at least six hours, are so out of the normal range for the normal procedures in conducting an actual polygraph examination as to be considered professionally and scientifically outrageous, and in my opinion, the conditions of this examination were simply abusive.

This interaction between Stephens and Deskovic is not consistent with a deception detection CQT, rather this examination is consistent with a guilt presumptive interrogation where the polygraph was used as an evidence ploy to elicit a confession. Moreover, if Mr. Deskovic's testimony concerning, for example the aggressive nature of the questioning, the false reporting of incriminating statements, and the threats and promises made by the Peekskill Police are credited (I make no assessment regarding credibility) the conduct of Stephens would be even more outrageous with regard to accepted practice in 1990."

All of the results in this category were for polygraphs taken by the defendant/exonerees before trial. In Colorado in 1987, <u>Tim Masters</u> was given a pre-trial polygraph examination by the police and it was inconclusive. After his conviction, a polygraph was arranged by his attorneys and he failed. However, because polygraphs administered before conviction are more important for this article than those performed afterwards, other factors being equal, the Masters case is classified in this article as "exoneree polygraph uncertain." The Masters case was the only known instance where an exoneree failed a post-conviction polygraph examination.

Another example of the classification issues for this article was the case of <u>Lenell Geter</u> in Texas. He was wrongly convicted of armed robbery in 1982. In one press account, the prosecutor stated that Geter had failed a pre-trial polygraph, but in another, his attorney said that the polygraph was inconclusive. After his release in 1984, Geter took two polygraph examinations in New York, administered by Nat Laurendi, and passed them both. The classification here is "exoneree uncertain," before trial.

In the case of <u>Anthony Caravella</u> in Florida, who was 15 years old at the time of his polygraph, the polygraph examiner, Tony Fantigrassi, reported that Caravella was truthful in two polygraph responses which acknowledged participation in a rape and murder. However, Fantigrassi reported that "unfortunately," Caravella's answer to a third question was

"inconclusive," and Fantigrassi recommended, "Further testing and/or interrogation may be needed to reach a conclusion." The actual "unfortunate" part of this case was that he and the Broward County Police Dept. did not follow up on the soft recommendation for further testing. What should have reinforced that recommendation was Fantigrassi's polygraph examination on the same day, January 4, 1984, of Ray Stephen Chappell whom Caravella had named in his confession as a participant in the crime. Chappell was determined by Fantigrassi to be truthful in his denial of involvement in the crime.

### Category: Polygraph of other person(s) with uncertain result

In 1990, Antoine Goff and John Tennison were convicted of murder in California primarily because of the testimony of two prosecution eye witnesses. During the investigation, one eye witness, Pauline Maluina, who was 14 at the time of the murder, had recanted her earlier statements and was given a polygraph examination which was said to be inconclusive. Afterwards, the witness was brought together with a cooperating witness to discuss their prospective testimony, and the witness also talked with the prosecutor. At trial, she testified with her pre-recantation version of events, and the polygraph and recantation were never brought to the attention of Goff's and Tennison's attorneys.

# Category: Polygraph of exoneree with reported failure

There were 25 cases classified as reported polygraph failures by exonerees, and all of them were prior to conviction, and all were by police polygraph examiners. It is not known if private polygraphs were arranged for any of these exonerees by their attorneys, which may have shown deception and which the attorneys may not have disclosed. However, as most, if not all, of the 25 were indigent, and their counsel publicly funded, it's unlikely that private polygraphs were arranged, but it's possible.

The best known such failure was the 1966 examination by Sgt. John J. McGuire of <u>Rubin "Hurricane" Carter</u>. The 1966 report stated that McGuire used "*standard polygraph procedure*" and then stated...

"RESULTS: Subject answered all pertinent questions."

- Q. Regarding the shooting at the Lafayette Grill, do you intend to answer truthfully each question about that?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you shoot any of those people last night at the Lafayette Grill?
- A. No.
- Q. Were you present last night at the Lafayette Grill when those people were shot?
- A. No.
- Q. Was your car used in that shooting last night at the Lafayette Grill?
- A No
- Q. Are you deliberately holding back information about that shooting last night at the Lafayette Grill?
- A. No.
- Q. Before the shooting occurred at the Lafayette Grill did you know it was going to happen?
- A. No.

CONCLUSIONS: After a careful analysis of the polygraph record of this subject it is the opinion of the examiner that this subject was attempting deception to all the pertinent questions. And was involved in this crime. After the examination and confronted with the examiner's opinion, the Subject denied any participation in the crime."

Another well-known case of polygraph failures for an exoneree was the Ohio case of Floyd Fay. He was accused of murder and the prosecutor offered to dismiss the charges if Fay would pass a polygraph exam. Fay agreed to take a polygraph and failed it. According to one source, he also failed a second polygraph. By Ohio procedures, his written agreement with the prosecutor made the evidence about the first failed polygraph admissible at his trial in 1978, and he was convicted. Two years later, he was exonerated when his attorney and others uncovered evidence about the real killers, and they were prosecuted. Fay became an articulate spokesperson against the use of polygraphs in criminal trials and his case was commented upon in several journals by polygraph opponents. As his conviction was for a capital offense, Fay also publicly opposed the re-introduction of the death penalty in Ohio after the moratorium caused by the 1972 U.S. Supreme Court case, Furman v. Georgia.

One case in this category of failed polygraphs involved the lowest level crime of the 250 cases: embezzlement of the amount of a nightly bank deposit from a hair salon. In 2005, <u>Lisa Hansen</u> left a deposit at a bank in Grand Rapids, Michigan, but the bank said it wasn't received. Hansen denied stealing the money, but she was fired by her employer. She took a police polygraph in the hope of proving her innocence. However, the polygraph examiner determined that she was "deceptive" and she was later found guilty of embezzlement. According to the National Registry of Exonerations summary of Hansen's case, "On the advice of her attorney, she elected to plead guilty, but the judge rejected her plea, and Hansen entered a diversion program which cost her \$400 and required 40 hours of community service. She completed the program and charges were dismissed in April 2006." In August of 2006, a bank employee found the missing envelope whereupon the bank apologized and reached an out-of-court compensation settlement with Hansen. Again, the claimed polygraph failure was obviously incorrect.

New Jersey's third exoneree polygraph failure (after Carter and Halsey) came with one of the most recent polygraph examinations. In 2006, <a href="Emmanuel Mervilus">Emmanuel Mervilus</a> was arrested in New Jersey for armed robbery and aggravated assault. He volunteered to take a polygraph in order to prove his innocence. He agreed that the results could be used at a subsequent trial, if any. When told that he failed the exam, Mervilus asked for a second exam, but the request was declined. Lieutenant John Kaminskas of the Union County Prosecutor Office testified at Mervilus's trial about the accuracy of polygraphs and Mervilus' failure. A New Jersey court reversed Mervilus's conviction primarily on the grounds that the polygraph results were relied upon excessively in the trial. The court noted that Kaminskas "testified that he had never encountered a situation in which he had opined that 'someone was . . . showing signs of deception, and [it later] came out that they were truthful.' " In February, 2013, Mervilus was found not guilty in a retrial.

The most devastating exoneree pre-trial polygraph failure came for <u>James L. Dean</u> who was one of the six defendants in the case of the murder of Helen Wilson of Beatrice, Nebraska. The "Beatrice Six," as they became known, served a total of 87 years in prison for a murder than none of them was actually involved in. The failed polygraph of James Dean was combined by the police with other techniques to secure his false confession and guilty pleas from him and four of the others in 1989. For this article, Dean is classified as a polygraph

failure, but there were two others polygraphs of defendant/exonerees in this case. Kathleen Gonzalez's polygraph seems to have had an uncertain result and Debra Shelden passed her polygraph. For the other three, Joseph White, Ada JoAnn Taylor and Joseph Winslow their cases are classified with "uncertain polygraphs of others," because of the mixed results of the polygaphs of Dean, Gonzalez and Shelden. Two of the six, Ada JoAnn Taylor and James L. Dean passed polygraphs during the post-conviction re-investigation in 2008 or 2009. However, the pre-trial polygraph results trump the post-conviction results for the purposes of this article. Only one of the Beatrice Six, Joseph White, went to trial and he was convicted in 1989 on the testimony of two of the Six, who, by that time likely believed their own lies. He was still in prison by the time of his DNA-related exoneration in 2008. The others were released earlier, by virtue of the reduced sentences from their guilty pleas.

It is likely that several, if not most, of the unevaluated 25 "exoneree failure" polygraphs will not withstand careful scrutiny by qualified polygraphists. For example, it was widely reported that three of the "Ford Heights Four" failed their polygraph examinations. If the "nonconfirmation of guilt or deception" rate of polygraphs is about 80%, as this article confirms, and, conversely the chance of erroneous determination of guilt is 20%, then it is highly unlikely (8/1000 or .008 or .8%, calculated as .20 x .20 x .20) that all three exonerees in the same case failed bona fide, properly conducted exams. Further, there was no evidence from the media accounts of the 25 that any special effort was made to support the original polygraph conclusions. For example, there were no reported requests by prosecutors or defense attorneys to give second polygraph examinations to them before trial, or to subject any of the tests to a Quality Control review.

Another potential reason for the presumed weakness of the failure results for the 25 unreviewed polygraphs is that several of the exonerees were likely ill-prepared for their exams and tired.

This discussion of polygraph failures by exonerees did not clearly find that police intentionally distorted any of the 25 polygraph results to produce the failures. That such a distortion is possible was documented in the case of <a href="Timothy Brown">Timothy Brown</a>, who was convicted in Florida in 1993 of murdering a policeman which occurred when he was 14, and to which he falsely confessed. In a 2002 hearing on a Motion for retrial for Timothy Brown, Broward County polygraph examiner Richard Hoffman admitted that his polygraph of an alternate suspect was faked. According to an Associated Press story, Hoffman "testified he was ordered to perform the lie detector test as a ruse, didn't ask required control questions and wrote a misleading report on test subject Andrew Johnson." The Timothy Brown case is not included in the totals for this article because the test was not a real test and therefore not a valid measurement of the accuracy of polygraphs.

The research for this article was restricted primarily to internet-available information. Sometimes only one news article or web address made a difference in the initial classification for this article in early 2013. To illustrate this point, consider the John Kogut, Dennis Halstead and John Restivo cases, where John Kogut was given a polygraph examination by the police. The police told him that he failed the exam, so he began to question his own sense of reality and gave a false confession. That confession, in turn, supported the wrongful convictions of Halstead, Restivo and himself. According to the Centurion Ministries summary of the case, John Kogut actually passed his polygraph exam, but that was the only account of the case on

the internet which clarifies that point, and that made all the difference for this study for not just one, but three cases. The Centurion Ministries account was confirmed in the article by Charles Honts and Mark Handler in the summer issue of <u>POLYGRAPH</u>, "A Case Study of the Validity of the Arther Examination Procedures in a Criminal Case With DNA Confirmation."

It is anticipated that several of the reported 25 polygraph examination failures were actually instances of non-deception. It is also anticipated that other classifications for this article will change as more information is obtained about each case.

As sometimes happened in the analysis of these exoneree polygraph cases, there was more than one polygraph and therefore the case could have involved more than one classification, but the research design allowed for only one category for each case. When that happened, the classification closest to the exoneree was primary. In "Hurricane" Carter's case, there were two other polygraphs. One was of Carter's co-defendant, John Artis, who also was reported to have failed his polygraph. The third polygraph was a given to a witness named Arthur Bello who was in the Lafayette Grill on the night of the murders and who said that Carter was not inside at the time. Before the second trial of Rubin Carter and John Artis in 1976, Bello was given a polygraph examination by Professor Leonard Harrelson and Bello passed. According to the 1987 Third Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals opinion, the chief detective on the case said that Professor Harrelson's conclusion was "impossible" and then simply ignored the exculpatory result.

The Anthony Graves case in Texas is another case with multiple polygraphs where the polygraph of the exoneree dominated the category classification. Graves failed his polygraph, and that's how the case is classified for this article. However, the actual murderer (as determined later), Robert Carter, also failed his polygraph. Without the exoneree polygraph, the case would have been classified as one where a polygraph of another person supported the exoneree's claim of innocence. As noted above, the quality of Graves' polygraph remains to be examined.

Of the 25 failed polygraphs of exonerees, one hundred percent (100%) occurred before trial, with polygraphs performed by the police. However, one case requiring clarification was that of <u>Tim Masters</u> who failed, as noted above, a post-conviction polygraph administered at the request of his attorneys. Because he had a pre-trial polygraph, which was inconclusive, his case is placed in this article in the "exoneree exam inconsistent" category as the pre-trial polygraphs have a higher priority. If Tim Masters' second polygraph is considered for the purpose of this paragraph only, then 96% of the reported failures were conducted by police and occurred before trial.

# Category: Polygraph of other person with result not supporting exoneree

In 1994, <u>Tiffany Pritchett</u> was charged in Pennsylvania with murder when her codefendant, Dameon Isbell, claimed that she, and not he, shot a store attendant during a robbery. Isbell passed a polygraph test which prompted the police to offer to polygraph Pritchett during her trial. After a four hour interrogation session, which was not recorded and during which the police took no notes, Pritchett allegedly confessed. It was Isbell's testimony and Pritchett's false confession which convicted her. She was released in 2006 after pleading the equivalent of an "Alford plea" in lieu of a new trial. Isbell was never charged with the murder.

In New York, <u>Lynn DeJac</u> had been convicted in 1994 of strangling her 13-year old daughter and was sentenced to 25 years in prison. Her boyfriend, Dennis Donohue, was initially a suspect in the crime, but he passed a polygraph test and became the primary

prosecution witness against DeJac. After DNA testing of the daughter's rape kit pointed toward Donohue, and after a determination that she died of cocaine poisoning, DeJac was released in 2008. That same year, Donohue was convicted of a 1993 strangulation murder in another case.

The results of the 250 cases involving exonerees and polygraphs show that polygraphs assist in the determination of the truth most of the time. The percentages depend upon how the "inconclusive" tests are used, but the percentage of 80% for a clear correct result is used for the purpose of this discussion. Conversely, there would be a 20% chance of failure. If a person claims to be telling the truth and fails a polygraph, then such a person should be given the opportunity to take another, because the probability of an innocent person failing two tests is 4.0% (.20 x .20). For similar reasons, if a polygraph examination for a person claiming innocence reaches an inconclusive result, that person should be offered the opportunity to take another examination.

During the research for this article, only one case, but not involving a wrongful conviction, was found where a person took two polygraphs, with clearly different results, i.e. from pass to fail, or the reverse. In Arkansas, <u>Ed Owens</u> was accused of child sexual abuse and took a polygraph which found that he was deceptive in his denials. Then he took another polygraph which found no deception. The case was dismissed prior to trial.

The largest number of polygraphs taken by any individual in the cases researched for this article was five, by Earl Mann in the Clarence Elkins case. In 1999, Elkins was convicted in Ohio of murdering Judith Johnson, and of attempted murder and rape of her six year old granddaughter. While wrongful convictions are among the unluckiest events one could imagine, it sometimes happens that such people get lucky. For Elkins, the luck came when the alternate suspect, Earl Mann, was sentenced to Elkins' prison for another crime and he smoked cigarettes. Elkins collected a discarded butt and sent it to his attorney, and the DNA tests showed a perfect match to the crimes for which Elkins was convicted. Still the prosecutor was not sure that the Elkins conviction was wrongful, so she offered polygraph tests to both men. She was still confident that Mann would pass and Elkins would decline to take a polygraph, or that he would fail if he did. So convinced were the police that Mann was not involved in the Johnson murder that when he failed the first polygraph test, they gave him another, and then another, and another, and another for a total of five failures over 10 hours over three days. At a 20% chance of a false reading, the chance that Mann was innocent after failing five tests is .032% (.20<sup>5</sup>). Elkins was released shortly afterwards, in 2005, without the prosecutor even needing to have a polygraph exam for him. The extent to which the prosecutor relied upon Mann's polygraph results vis a vis the DNA tests is not known. The point here is that the polygraph examinations were accurate about Mann's deception.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In the cases of 250 exonerees, polygraphs examinations pointed toward the correct result at least 80% of the time. This is accurate enough to warrant careful consideration of their use as evidence in criminal trials, as is now the practice in New Mexico. Even without the acceptance as evidence, this accuracy level is sufficient for investigators and lawyers to use the results of polygraph examinations to more aggressively search for and uncover the truth. One way to further that search for truth is to give more polygraph examinations.

As additional information surfaces about these 250 cases, and especially the claimed 25 polygraph failures by exonerees, and 32 uncertain results for exoneree polygraphs, it is expected that the reliability percentage will increase. Updates of this article will be <u>posted</u> <u>online</u>.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

The positive results of this study should send a message to police, prosecutors, defense attorneys, polygraph examiners and the general public that properly administered polygraphs are useful to the pursuit of truth and, therefore, justice. These results also support the following recommendations:

- 1. Polygraphs should be encouraged for defendants claiming innocence and for witnesses whose testimony supports that innocence as well as for witnesses whose expected testimony points toward guilt.
- 2. Investigative polygraphs should be administered by certified polygraph examiners and be recorded on audio/video from beginning to end, and be available for Quality Control Reviews.
- 3. If an initial polygraph indicates that a suspect or defendant is deceptive, or the examination is inconclusive, AND the person insists on innocence, then the examinee should be offered the opportunity to have a second polygraph. A similar offer should be made for initial polygraphs of witnesses or informants, and they should be available for Quality Control Reviews.
- 4. Police, prosecutors and defense attorneys should pay more attention to the results of polygraphs. Every polygraph examination result which is partially or completely inconsistent with police and prosecutors' theories of a case should give police and prosecutors pause and should prompt a request for a second polygraph test by another examiner. As noted in this article, such inconsistency can work in two ways. First, such inconsistency would appear when a witness or suspect is found to be truthful when contradicting the police theory of a case, or when the polygraph results are inconclusive. Second, the inconsistency can appear when a witness who supports the police theory is found to be deceptive or the examination result is inconclusive.

The 1987 cases of Gordon Steidl and Herbert Whitlock illustrate the importance of this recommendation for re-testing. These co-defendants were convicted in substantial part upon the testimony of Derrell Herrington. During the investigation, Herrington failed a polygraph, so the cases are classified as "polygraphs supporting exonerees." The polygraph examiner recommended a second test, but the investigators ignored the examination failure and the recommendation; and proceeded to trial with Herrington's testimony. The fact of his polygraph failure was not made known to defense attorneys

Given the powerful odds noted above of the accuracy of results when two tests are given, it should be considered unethical and unprofessional to proceed in a case with a theory contrary to a polygraph result without a second polygraph, and/or without thorough and open reevaluation of a prosecution or defense. When prosecutors proceed to trial and a conviction in spite of a claim of innocence supported by a doubly passed polygraph, they bear a special burden to justify their actions.

5. Claims of innocence by inmates who have passed, or at least not failed, polygraph examinations should be given more careful consideration. In addition, all inmates who claim innocence (See www.registryofclaimsofinnocence.org) should be offered the opportunity to take a polygraph exam. While searching for exonerees and their cases which involved polygraphs, 53 cases were found where current inmates have passed polygraphs, but their claims of innocence languish. For another 24, the polygraphs of others supports the claimants' innocence. Most of those polygraphs were conducted prior to trials, but the inmates were convicted nonetheless, just as were the 51 exonerees identified in this article. Some of the 53 current inmates have passed their polygraphs while in prison, such as Brian Chevalier in New Hampshire in 2010. If the validity of his polygraph exam is not believed, then he should be given the opportunity to take another polygraph exam. Sixteen more inmates were identified who have taken polygraphs while in prison which have produced inconclusive results. As argued above, such a result is contrary to the expectation that every person convicted of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt should be found by a polygraph to be deceptive when denying culpability for that crime. When a polygraph does not find clear deception, police and prosecutors should pay attention, and a second test should be offered. Also, where two people have offered different versions of the same event and one is clearly lying, the American Polygraph Assn. Model Policy for Paired Testing could be used.

In the New Hampshire State Prison, <u>Chad Evans</u> took a polygraph exam in April 2012 and the results were found to be inconclusive inconclusive because of flaws in the conduct of the examination. Evans is a client of the writer of this article and he has requested a second test, to be financed by his own supporters. The prison warden and his superiors have, so far, denied him such a test. In the research for this article, only four cases were found where a prison refused to permit a polygraph exam. One was the case of <u>Alonzo Watts</u>, who was convicted of murder in Pennsylvania. In 2006, a Centurion Ministries volunteer and an investigative reporter were actively working on his case and Watts had agreed to take a polygraph exam, but the prison denied the request. Watts died in prison that year, before he and his supporters had a chance to persuade the prison warden, perhaps via the governor or a court order, to permit the polygraph exam. Another case is that of <u>James Rodgers</u> in Illinois whose request was denied in 2013. The fourth, and most dramatic, was that of <u>Troy Davis</u> of Georgia whose request for a polygraph examination on September 20, 2011 was denied by prison officials. He was executed the next day, on September 21.

- 6. In 2012, Rob Warden and Ron Frederickson of the Center on Wrongful Convictions recommended in their article "The Role of False Confessions in Illinois Wrongful Conviction Cases" that any confessions which police claim to have received after telling a polygraph examinee that s/he failed should not be admissible in court. That recommendation is supported here, unless the entire polygraph interview and examination is video and audio recorded and subject to judicial review. Further, as recommended above, when a suspect fails a polygraph examination or whose examination is "inconclusive," s/he should be offered the opportunity to have a second examination by another polygraph examiner. Of course, all suspects must be advised of their rights to consult an attorney.
- 7. Every polygraph of a person convicted beyond a reasonable doubt that does not show that person to be deceptive when denying responsibility for the crime should be given a Quality Control Review. The American Polygraph Association (APA), or American Association of

Police Polygraphists, or other group or individuals should fully investigate the 25 cases listed in the <u>linked spreadsheet</u> to this article where exonerees were said to fail, or did fail polygraphs, and the 8 cases where the polygraphs of others were clearly inconsistent with the exonerees' innocence. From that investigation should come a determination of how many of the 33 (25 + 8) unexplained failures of polygraph examinations of exonerees and witnesses were due to polygraph examiner failure and how many were due to the inherent imprecision of the device and process themselves.

- 8. The American Polygraph Association could offer to dedicate itself and its members to exonerating the wrongly convicted and to preventing future wrongful convictions. Polygraph Examiners participated in the 1950's and early 1960's in Erle Stanley Gardner's "Court of Last Resort" which evaluated claims of innocence, and which sometimes resulted in exoneration, or commutation of sentences. In the 1970's the APA had a Case Review Committee which provided some polygraph assistance to claimants of innocence. The Committee conducted two polygraphs of Louis Greco in 1978 and found him to be truthful in the second examination. He passed one or or two others, too. His alibi, that he was in Florida at the time Edward Deegan was murdered in Massachusetts, was clear enough to make the polygraph results persuasive. However, the prosecutors ignored the polygraphs, which led to 30+ years of misery for the four men convicted of murdering Deegan. Two of the men died in prison. Some State chapters of the APA did similar work into the 1990's, formally or informally. The recommendation here is that the APA recommit itself to this work of exonerating the wrongly convicted and preventing wrongful convictions. The leading agent of the innocence movement since 1989 has been DNA, but DNA is present in only about 5% of all crimes or major crimes. Similarly, fingerprints are present in about 5% of cases. On the other hand, at least one living human being is present in every single crime, at least when it begins, and therefore, the potential for polygraphs to play a greater role in this work on wrongful convictions is large.
- 9. The data for this article should continue to be evaluated and updated and posted on the internet, and the article should be periodically updated.

Non-l		/ Total:	171 79	TOTALS	250	E4		_									_
1b	Sub to Yrs to Exntn			Doroontono of Tatal		51	63	25	24	32	0	19	3	25	0	6	
1b	Yrs to Exntn	tal		Percentage of Total		20.4%	25.2%	10.0%	9.6%	12.8%	0.0%	7.6%	1.2%	10.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.89
1b	Yrs to Exntn		250			1b	1a	2b	2a	3b	3a			5b	5a	6b	6a
1b		3342		years per exoneree													-
				supported innocence BEFC	RF c	onvictio	n										
N/I	· orygraphic c	- OXOII	0.000														
IVII	1939 1941	2		Jere Snodgrass	1	1	0										
PA	1959 1991	32		Jerry Pacek	1	1	0										
FL	1960 1966			Joseph Shea	1	1	0										
MA	1968 2001	33		Louis Greco	1	1	0										
СТ	1973 1976	3		Peter Reilly	1	1	0										
NM	1973 1979	6		Terry Seaton	1	1	0										
ОН	1979 2005	26	IP OH	Gary Reece	1	1	0										
CA	1980 1996			Kevin Lee Green	1	1	0										
DC	1980 2012	32		Santae Tribble	1	1	0										
TX	1981 1990			Clarence Brandley	1	1	0										
IL	1981 2012			Andre Davis	1	1	0										
IL	1982 1992			Steven Linscott	1	1	0										
ID	1983 2001	18		Charles Fain	1	1	0										
CA	1984 1992	8		Margie Grafton (Bakersfield)	1	1	0										
CA	1984 2004			John Stoll (Bakersfield)	1	1	0										
CA	1984 2004			Grant Self (Bakersfield)	1	1	0										<u> </u>
MT	1984 2011	27		Barry Beach	1	1	0										<u> </u>
NJ	1985 1993			Margaret Kelly Michaels	1	1	0										├
NY	1985 1987	2		Marion Coakley	1	1	0										
TX	1985 1993			Muneer Deeb	1	1	0										
IN	1986 2000			Jerry Watkins	1	1	0										<del>                                     </del>
NY	1986 2005			John Kogut	1	1	0										<del>                                     </del>
TX OK	1987 2011 1988 1999			Michael Morton  Dennis Fritz	1	1	0										<del>                                     </del>
NJ	1988 1999	19		Byron Halsey	1	1	0										
NJ	1988 2007			Paul Kamienski	1	1	0										-

TX	1989 2002	13	Christopher Ochoa	1	1	0						
NY	1990 2003	13	Yusef Salaam (CP Five)	1	1	0						
NY	1991 2009	18	Fernando Bermudez	1	1	0						
ОН	1991 2011		Roger Dean Gillespie	1	1	0						
NY	1991 2013	22	David Ranta	1	1	0						
IL	1992 1998	6	Francisco Vera	1	1	0						
PA	1992 2011	19	Don Ray Adams	1	1	0						
TX	1993 2011	18	Tony Hall	1	1	0						
IL	1993 2012	19 CWC	Juan Rivera	1	1	0						
CA	1994 1997	3	Brenda Kniffen	1	1	0						
CA	1994 1997	3	Scott Kniffen	1	1	0						
AR	1994 2011	17	Jessie Miskelley (WM 3)	1	1	0						
ОН	1994 2009		Nancy Smith	1	1	0						
UT	1995 2013	18	<u>Debra Brown</u>	1	1	0						
NY	1996 2000	4	Patrick Griffin	1	1	0						
RI	1996 2002		Scott Hornoff	1	1	0						
AZ	1998 2011	13	Amando Castillo	1	1	0						
TX	1999 2012	13	Kenneth Boyd, Jr.	1	1	0						
VA	1999 2009	10	Joseph Dick (Norfolk4)	1	1							
VA	2000 2011	11	Derek Tice (Norfolk4)	1	1							
VA	1999 2009	10	Danial Williams (Norfolk4)	1	1							_
VA	1999 2009	10	Eric Wilson (Norfolk4)	1	1							
PR	2000 2009	9	Luis Santaliz Acosta	1	1	0						_
MI	2002 2004	2	Davian Woods	1	1	0						
			Subtotal	51								_
												_

1a	Polygra	phs of	exonerees	supported innocence AFTE	R conviction					
IL		1944	11	Joseph Majczek	1	1				
CO		1946	7	Loren Hamby	1	1				
WV		1960	10	Robert Ballard Bailey	1	1				
NY		1955	1	Paul Pfeffer	1	1				
MI		1967	1	Louis Nasir	1	1				
FL	1967	1971	4	David Ronald Wilson	1	1				
WI		1981	9	Francis Hemauer	1	1				
PA		2002	28 CM	Edward Baker	1	1				
DC		2005	30 CM	Joseph Eastridge	1	1				
MI		2010	35	Edward George Carter	1	1				
MI		1977	1	Garner Bailey	1	1				
OH		2003	26 CM	Timothy Howard	1	1				
OH		2003	26 CM	Gary James	1	1				
IN		1980	2	<u>Larry Hicks</u>	1	1				
IL		1988	9	Gary Dotson	1	1				
IL		1995	15	James Newsome	1	1				
ОН		2001	20 CM	Daniel Brown	1	1				
NY		1984	2	Nathaniel Carter	1	1				
KY		2010	28	Michael VonAllmen	1	1				
PA		1995	12	Terence McCracken	1	1				
FL		2001	18	Christopher Clugston	1	1				
VA		2011		Thomas Haynesworth	1	1				
TX	1985	1990	5	Martin Kimsey	1	1				
MA		2013	26 CM	Mark Schand	1	1				
OR		2005	17	Alfredo Domenech	1	1				
OR		2005	17	Ivan Serrano	1	1				
NY	1989	1992	3	Richard Knupp	1	1				
MD	1989	1994	5	Bernard Ward	1	1				
NY		1999	10	Timothy Crosby	1	1				
IL		2006	17	Joseph Burrows	1	1				
CA		2009		George Shull	1	1				
NY		2002	12	Lamont Branch	1	1				
NY		2007	17	Martin Tankleff	1	1				
OR		1995	4	John Sosnovske (with Pav)	1	1				
TX	1991	1992	1	Rickey Dale Thomas	1	1				

NY	1992	2000	8	Gerald Harris	1	1					
TX	1992	2005	13	John Michael Harvey	1	1					
NC	1993	2010	17	Greg Taylor	1	1					
KY	1994	2011	17 IP KY	Edwin Chandler	1	1					
MD	1995	2000	5	Antoine Pettiford	1	1					
NY	1995	2001	6	Arthur Stewart	1	1					
CA	1995	2012	17	John Edward Smith III	1	1					
NY	1995	2007	12	Carlos Cardenas	1	1					
NY	1995	2007	12	Napoleon Cardenas	1	1					
TX	1995	2009	14 CM	Richard Miles	1	1					
TX	1997	2000	3	Anthony Curlin	1	1					
TX	1997	2009	12	Christopher Scott	1	1					
TX	1997	2009	12	Claude Simmons	1	1					
CA	1997	2005	8	Arvind Balu	1	1					
NC	1997	2002	5	Terence Garner	1	1					
CA	1997	2013	16	George Souliotis	1	1					
TX	1997	2013	16	Elizabeth Ramirez, SA4	1	1					
TX	1998	2013	15	Kristie Mayhugh, SA4	1	1					
TX	1998	2013	15	Cassandra Rivera, SA4	1	1					
TX	1998	2013	15	Anna Vasquez, SA4	1	1					
NY	1999	2007	8	Stephen G. Schulz	1	1					
NC	2001	2008	7	Erick Daniels	1	1					
CA	2002	2009	7	Rafael Madrigal, Jr.	1	1					
MO	2005	2013	8	Ryan Ferguson	1	1					
AL	2006	2012	6	Zachary Noah Smith	1	1					
MI	2006	2013	7	Jacob Trakhtenberg	1	1					
CA	2006	2013	7	Ronald Ross	1	1					
GA	2010	2013	3	Nathan Christopher Dwight	1	1					
				Subtotal	63						
											į

	i oiygia	יוט ווקג	mera supp	orted exoneree innocence				1				
IL	1933	1944	11	Theodore Marcinkiewicz	1		1					
FL	1963		12	Freddie Pitts	1		1					
FL	1963		12	Wilbert Lee	1		1					
MA	1968	2001	33	Peter Limone	1		1					
MA	1968	2001	33	Joseph Salvati	<u>1</u>		1					
MA	1968	2001	33	Henry Tameleo	1		1					
CA	1900	1992	17			1	I					
CA	1975	1992	17	Clarence Chance	1	1						
				Benny Powell		1	4					
DC	1975	2005	30 CM 16	Joseph Sousa	1		1					
FL	1976			Sonia Jacobs	1	1						
TX	1977	1997	20 CM	Kerry Max Cook	1	1						
IA			25	Terry Harrington	1	1						
IA			25	Curtis McGhee	1	1	L.					
NY	1982		19	Colin Warner	1		1					
МО	1983		16	Ellen Reasonover	1		1					
MD			29	Mark Farley Grant	1	1						
NY			29 CM	Dennis Halstead	1	1						
NY			29 CM	John Restivo	1	1						
TX	1984		9	Federico Macias	1	1						
MD	1985		8	Kurt Bloodsworth	1	1						
WV	1987	1993	6	John Thomas Marvin	1	1						
MA	1987	1998	11	Violet Amirault	1	1						
IL	1987	2004	17	Gordon Steidl	1	1						
IL	1987	2008	21	Herbert Whitlock	1	1						
NY	1985		5	Albert Algarin	1	1						
NY	1986		4	<u>Jesus Torres</u>	1	1						
MI			25	Raymond Highers	1		1					
MI	1988		25	Thomas Highers	1		1					
IL	1989	1996	7	Ralph Frye	1		1					
NY	1989	2013	24	Derrick Deacon	1		1					
TX	1990	2002	12	Richard Danziger	1	1						
FED	1991	1992	1	Gerald Minski	1	1						
OR	1991	1995	4	Laverne Pavlinak (with Sos)	1		1					
TX	1992	2008	16	Patrick Leondos Waller	1		1					
ОН	1994	2009	15 IP OH	Joseph Allen	1	1						

VA	1994	1995	1	Christopher E. Prince	1			1				
NC	1998	2010	12	Derrick Allen	1		1					
NC	1998	2004	6	Alan Gell	1		1					
TX	1998	2001	3	Morris Jones	1			1				
TX	1998	2011	13	Dale Duke	1			1				
OR	1999	2002	3	Pamela Reser	1			1				
ОН	1999	2005	6	Clarence Elkins	1			1				
TX	1999	2009	10	Michael Toney	1		1					
TX	1999	2011	12	Daniel Roy Settle (Tulia)	1			1				
VA	2001	2012	11	Michael Hash	1		1					
IN	2002	2013	11	David Camm	1			1				
MI	2003	2004	1	Vidale McDowell	1		1					
ОН	2003	2012	9	Bryant Gaines	1			1				
KY	2006	2008	2	Jason Girts	1			1				
				Subtotal	49							
3	Polygra	aphs of	exonerees	uncertain result and use								
NE	1956		13	<u>Darrel Parker</u>	1				1			
IL	1956	1971	15	Lloyd Eldon Miller	1				1			
CA	1961	1971	10	Paul Kern Imbler	1				1			
FL	1971	1973	2	David Keaton	1				1			
AZ	1971	2013	42	Louis Cuen Taylor	1				1			
СТ	1973	1989	16	Benjamin F. Miller, Jr.	1				1			
IL	1977	2006		Johnny Lee Savory	1				1			
MO	1979	1983	4	Melvin Reynolds	1				1			
CA	1980	2004	24	Thomas Goldstein	1				1			
FL	1984	2010	26	Anthony Caravella	1				1			
TX	1982	1984	2	<u>Lenell Geter</u>	1				1			
WA	1984	1997	13	Benjamin Harris	1				1			
IL	1988	2001	13	Marcellius Bradford Chic 4A	1				1	-		
IL	1988	2006	18	Marcus Lyons	1				1	-		
OK	1988	1999	11	Ron Williamson	1				1	-		
NY	1989	2009	20 IP	Steven Barnes	1				1	-		
OR	1989	2006	17	Drew Whitley	1				1			
NE	1989	2009	20	Kathleen Gonzalez (Beatce6	1				1	-		
NY	1990	2006	16 IP NY	Jeffrey Deskovic	1				1			i

ΑZ	1990	2013	23		<u>Debra Milke</u>	1			1				
NY	1992	2010	18	IP NY	Frank Sterling	1			1				
IL	1993	1996	3		Gary Gauger	1			1				
AR	1994	2011	17		Damien Echols (WM3)	1			1				
NY	1996	2006	10		Daniel Gristwood	1			1				
WA	1996	2007	11		Ted Bradford	1			1				
LA	1997	2012	15		Damon Thibodeaux	1			1				
ОН	1997	2013	16		Douglas Prade	1			1				
LA	1998	2006	8		Travis Hayes	1			1				
CA	1999	2000	1		David Quindt	1			1				
CO	1999	2008	9		<u>Tim Masters</u>	1			1				
UT	2004	2007	3		Warren Clifford Hales	1			1				
IL	2006	2013	7		Nicole Harris	1			1				
					Subtotal	32							

						ı							
NM	1974	1976	2	Thomas Gladish (NM4)	1				1				
NM	1974	1976	2	Richard Greer (NM4)	1				1				
NM	1974	1976	2	Ronald Keine (NM4)	1				1				
NM	1974	1976	2	Clarence Smith (NM4)	1				1				
FL	1974	1987	13	Joseph Green Brown	1				1				
MO	1986	2003	17	Joseph Amrine	1					1			
IL	1988	2001	13	Calvin Ollins Chicago 4A	1				1				
IL	1988	2001	13	Larry Ollins Chicago 4A	1				1				
IL	1988	2001	13	Omar Saunders Chicago 4A	1				1				
NE	1989	2008	19	Joseph White (Beatrice 6)	1				1				
NE	1989	2009	20	JoAnn Taylor (Beatrice 6)	1				1				
NE	1990	2009	19	Thomas Winslow (Beatrce6)	1				1				
CA	1990	2003	13	Antoine Goff	1				1				
CA	1990	2003	13	John Tennison	1				1				
NC	1994	2008	14	Glen Chapman	1				1				
MO	1994	2009	15	Joshua Kezer	1				1				
KY	1998	2001	3	Larry Osborne	1				1				
IL	1999	2002	3	Omar Aguirre (Chicago 4)	1				1				
IL	2001	2003	2	Robert Gayol (Chicago 4)	1				1				
NC	1993	2008	15	Levon Junior Jones	1				0	1			
NC	1993	2013	20	<u>Larry Lamb</u>	1				0	1			
AK	2007	2012	5	Mechele Hughes Linehan	1				1				
				Subtotal	22	.   _					T	T	_

5	Exoner	ees fa	iled po	olvarar	ohs									
													-	
NJ	1967	1985	18		Rubin Hurricane Carter	1					1			
ΑZ	1975	2012	37		William Macumber	1					1			
TX	1977	1989	12		Randall Dale Adams	1					1			
ОН	1978	1980	2		Floyd Fay	1					1			
IL	1978	1996	18	CWC	Kenneth Adams (FordH4)	1					1			
IL	1978	1996	18	CWC	Willie Rainge (Ford Hghts 4)	1					1			
IL	1978	1996		CWC	Dennis Williams (FordH4)	1					1			
FL	1981	2008			William Dillon	1					1			
KS	1982	2003			Eddie Lowery	1					1			
NV	1982	1996	14		Roberto Miranda	1					1			
CA	1985	2009			Bruce Lisker	1					1			
TX	1987	2004	17		Ernest Ray Willis	1					1			
NE	1989	2008			James L. Dean (Beatrice 6)	1					1			
CA	1990	1992	2		Kelvin Wiley	1					1			
ОН	1991	2002	11		Jimmy Williams	1					1			
ОН	1991	2008	17	IP	Robert McClendon	1					1			
TX	1992	2010			Anthony Graves	1					1			
IA	1994	1997	3		Mary Weaver	1					1			
IL	2000	2003	3		Luis Ortiz (Chicago 4)	1					1			
TX	2000	2006	6		Brandy Briggs	1					1			
WI	2001	2005	4		Evan Zimmerman	1					1			
IL	2002	2003	1		Edar Duarte Santos (Chicago	1					1			
MA	2002	2009			Michael O'Laughlin	1					1			
MI	2006	2006			<u>Lisa Hansen</u>	1					1			
NJ	2008	2011	3		Emmanuel Mervilus	1					1			
					Subtotal	25								

	6	Polygra	aph of o	thers	s not s	upport exoneee innocence									
F	Ë	1974	1982	8		<u>Delbert Tibbs</u>	1							1	
IL		1978	1996	18	CWC	Verneal Jimerson (FordH4)	1						1		
F	Γ	1986	2003	17		Rudolph Holton	1						1		
N	ΙY	1986	2002	16		Angelo Martinez	1							1	
С	)R	1994	2006	12		Tiffany Pritchett	1						1		
N	ΙY	1994	2008	14		Lynn DeJac	1						1		
С	Н	1998	2011	13		Thomas Siller	1						1		
С	Н	1998	2011	13		Walter Zimmer	1						1		
						Subtotal	8								
		total of	subtotals	3	250										

SUI	MMAR	Y ANI	CO	NCLU	SIONS														
	e Catego																		
				rees su	pported inn before tria	ı		20.4%											
					er conviction			25.2%											
					ted exoneree inn bef tri	ial		10.0%											
					ted exoneree inn after t			9.6%											
	65.2%																		
3b	Polyara	nhs of	evone	raas iir	c result and use bef tri	ial		12.8%											
3a					nc result and use after t			0.0%											
4b					in result and use bef tr			7.6%											
4a					in result and use after			1.2%											
	21.6%							1.270											
5b					s before trial			10.0%											
5a					s after trial			0.0%											
6b					port exoneee inn bef tr			2.4%											
6a				not sup	port exoneee inn after			0.8%											
	13.2%	Subtot	al				тот	99											
	CONC	CLUSI	ONS																
		Of	the	250	polygraph exoneration	cases		65.2%	of pol	varaph	s cor	ectly po	ointed	1					
		to inno	cence		neree, while					ot help									
		Of the		474			444	00 =0/	-61				-!						
					polygraphs of exonere neree, while	ees,	114 25					ectly po							
			cence	or exor	neree, while		32			nconcli		exone	ree s	guiit					
		and					32	18.7%	were i	nconcii	usive.								
					taking a polygraph and			4.6	:1	78%		(calcul							
		determ	ine hi	s/her in	nocence (w/o consider	ing inco	onclus	ives)		82%		(calcul	ated I	oy divid	ding t	he nur	nbers	of cas	ses)
		Odds f	or exo	nerees	l taking a polygraph and	d helpin	na	5.8	·1	83%		(calcul	ated I	ov divid	dina t	he per	centa	ges)	
					nocence, and consider					85%		(calcul							ses)
		Note:	This e	ntire st	udy did not, and could	not con	trol fo	r quality	of poly	graph.									

* Org	ganizatio	ons											
	CWC	Center for	or Wi	rongful	Convictions								
	CM	Centurio	n Mir	nistries									
	IP	Innocend	ce Pr	oject									

Polygrap	hs and	d Inno	cence	e - Exc	onerees and polygraph	ıs, by	y State											
					. , , , .		Total	114	top to	otal c	heck				250			
Exon	eree Po	lygraph	Totals	171	TOTALS	250	51	63		24		0	21	1	25	0	6	2
	Exonere			79	Percentage of Total		20%	25%	10%	10%	13%	0%	8%	0%	10%	0%	2%	1%
		o . c.,	TOT	250	3		before		1070	.070	.0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1070	0,0		. 70
ot			101	230	COLUMN	#	1b	1a	2h	2a	3h	3a	4h	4a	5h	5a	6h	6a
41 State	Yr of	Yr of	# of	Org.*	CASES	"	10	ıα	20	<u> </u>	OD	ou	70	τu	OD	ou	OD	ou
	Convtn		Years	O.g.	0,1020													
1 FED	1991	1992	1		Gerald Minski	1			1									
1 AK	2007	2012	5		Mechele Hughes Linehan	1							1					
1 AL	2006	2012	6		Zachary Noah Smith	1		1										
1 AR	1994	2011	17		Damien Echols(WM3)	1					1							
	1994	2011	17		Jessie Miskelley (WM 3)	1	1	0										
4 4 7	4075	0040	07		MCH: BA	1									4			
1 AZ	1975	2012	37		William Macumber	1					4				1			
	1971	2013	42 23		Louis Cuen Taylor	1					1							
	1990 1998	2013 2011	13		Debra Milke Armando Castillo	1	1	0			1							
	1996	2011	13		Armando Castillo	ı	1	U										
1 CA	1975	1992	17		Clarence Chance	1			1									
1 0/1	1961	1971	10		Paul Kern Imbler	1					1							
	1975	1992	17		Benny Powell	1			1									
	1980	1996	16		Kevin Lee Green	1	1	0										
	1980	2004	24		Thomas Goldstein	1					1							
	1983	2009	26		Bruce Lisker	1									1			
	1984	2004	20	IP CA	John Stoll (Bakersfield)	1	1	0										
	1984	2004	20		Grant Self (Bakersfield)	1	1	0										
	1984	1992	8		Margie Grafton (Bakersfield)		1	0										
	1989	2009			George Shull	1		1										
	1990	1992	2		Kelvin Wiley	1									1			
	1990	2003	13		Antoine Goff	1							1					
	1990	2003	13		John Tennison	1							1					
	1994	1997	3		Brenda Kniffen	1	1	0										

		1994	1997	3	Scott Kniffen	1	1	0								
		1995	2012	17	John Edward Smith III	1		1								
		1997	2005	8	Arvind Balu	1		1								
		1997	2013	16	George Souliotis	1		1								
		1999	2000	1	David Quindt	1					1					
		2002	2009	7	Rafael Madrigal, Jr.	1		1								
		2006	2013	7	Ronald Ross	1		1								
				TOT	2.	1										
1	CO	1939	1946	7	Loren Hamby	1		1								
		1999	2008	9	Tim Masters	1					1					
1	CT	1973	1976	3	Peter Reilly	1	1	0								
		1973	1989		Benjamin F. Miller, Jr.	1					1					
1	DC	1975	2005	30 CM	Joseph Eastridge	1		1								
		1975	2005	30 CM	Joseph Sousa	1				1						
		1980	2012	32	Santae Tribble	1	1	0								
1	FL	1963	1975	12	Freddie Pitts	1				1						
		1963	1975	12	Wilbert Lee	1				1						
		1960		6	Joseph Shea	1	1	0								
		1967	1971	4	David Ronald Wilson	1		1								
		1971	1973	2	David Keaton	1					1					
		1974	1982	8	Delbert Tibbs	1									1	
		1974	1987	13	Joseph Green Brown	1						1				
		1976	1992	16	Sonia Jacobs	1			1							
		1981	2008	27	William Dillon	1							1			
		1983		18	Christopher Clugston	1		1								
		1984	2010	26	Anthony Caravella	1					1					
		1986	2003	17	Rudolph Holton	1								1		
1	GA	2010	2013	3	Nathan Christopher Dwight	1		1								
1	IA	1978	2003	25	Terry Harrington	1			1							
		1978	2003	25	Curtis McGhee	1			1							
		1994	1997	3	Mary Weaver	1			•				1			
	1	.001	.001	•									•			

1	ID	1983	2001	18		Charles Fain	1	1	0							
•		1000	2001			Chance Lam										
1	IL	1933	1944	11		Joseph Majczek	1		1							
		1933	1944	11		Theodore Marcinkiewicz	1				1					-
		1956	1971	15		Lloyd Eldon Miller	1					1				-
		1977	2006	29	CWC	Johnny Lee Savory	1					1				
		1978	1996	18	CWC	Kenneth Adams (FordH4)	1							1		
		1978	1996			Verneal Jimerson (FordH4)	1								1	-
		1978	1996	18	CWC	Willie Rainge (Ford Hghts 4)	1							1		
		1978	1996	18	CWC	Dennis Williams (FordH4)	1							1		
		1979	1988	9		Gary Dotson	1		1							
		1980	1995	15		James Newsome	1		1							
		1981	2012	31		Andre Davis	1	1	0							
		1982	1992	10		Steven Linscott	1	1	0							
		1987	2004	17		Gordon Steidl	1			1						
		1987	2008	21		Herbert Whitlock	1			1						
		1988	2001	13		Marcellius Bradford	1					1				
		1988	2001	13		Calvin Ollins Chicago 4A	1						1			
		1988	2001	13		Larry Ollins Chicago 4A	1						1			
		1988	2001	13		Omar Saunders Chicago 4A	1						1			
		1988	2006	18		Marcus Lyons	1					1				
		1989	2006	17		Joseph Burrows	1		1							
		1989	1996	7		Ralph Frye	1				1					
		1992	1998	6		Francisco Vera	1	1	0							
		1993	1996	3		Gary Gauger	1					1				
		1993	2012		CWC	Juan Rivera	1	1	0							
		1999	2002	3		Omar Aquirre (Chicago 4)	1						1			
		2001	2003	2		Robert Gayol (Chicago 4)	1						1			
		2000	2003	3		Luis Ortiz (Chicago 4)	1							1		
		2002	2003	1		Edar Zavier Duarte Santos (	1							1		
		2006	2013	7		Nicole Harris	1					1				
					TOT	29										
1	IN	1978	1980	2		Larry Hicks	1		1							
		1986	2000	14		Jerry Watkins	1	1	0							
		2002	2013	11		David Camm	1				1					

1	KS	1982	2003	21	Eddie Lowery	1									1		
-	110	1002	2000		Eddic Lowery	,											
1	KY	1982	2010	28	Michael VonAllmen	1			1								
		1994	2011		IP KY Edwin Chandler	1			1								
		1998	2001	3		1							1				
		2006	2008	2	Jason Girts	1	l				1		-				
1	LA	1997	2012	15		1						1					
		1998	2006	8		1						1					
1	MA	1968	2001	33	Louis Greco	1		1	0								
		1968	2001	33	Peter Limone	1					1						
		1968	2001	33	Joseph Salvati	1					1						
		1968	2001	33		1					1						
		1987	1998	11		1				1							
		1987	2013	26	Mark Schand	1			1								
		2002	2009	7	Michael O'Laughlin	1									1		
1	MD	1983	2012	29		1				1							
		1985	1993	8		1				1							
		1989	1994	5		1			1								
		1995	2000	5	Antoine Pettiford	1			1								
1	MI	1939	1941	2		1		1	0								
		1966	1967	1		1			1								
		1975	2010	35		1			1								
		1977	1977	1		1			1								
		1988	2013	25		1					1						
		1988	2013	25		1					1						
		2002	2004	2		1		1	0								
		2003	2004	1	Vidale McDowell	1				1							
		2006	2006	0		1									1		
		2006	2013	7	Jacob Trakhtenberg	1			1								
1	МО	1979	1983	4	,	1						1					
		1986	2003	17		1								1			
		1983	1999	16	Ellen Reasonover	1					1						

1 MT 1 NC	1984	2013	8	Ryan Ferguson	1		4						1
	1984	2011					1						
	1984	2011											
1 NC			27	Barry Beach	1	1	0						
1 NC													
	1993	2008	15	Levon Junior Jones	1					1			ı
	1993	2010	17	Greg Taylor	1		1						ı
	1993	2013	20	Larry Lamb	1					1			
	1994	2008	14	Glen Chapman	1					1			l
	1997	2002	5	Terence Garner	1		1						
	1998	2010	12	Derrick Allen	1			1					
	1998	2004	6	Alan Gell	1			1					
	2001	2008	7	Erick Daniels	1		1						
1 NE	1956	1969	13	Darrel Parker	1				1				
	1989	2008	19	Joseph White (Beatrice 6)	1					1			
	1989	2009	20	JoAnn Taylor (Beatrice 6)	1					1			
	1989	2009	20	Debra Shelden (Beatrice 6)	1	1	0						
	1989	2009	20	Kathleen Gonzalez (Beatce6	1				1				
	1989	2008	19	James L. Dean (Beatrice 6)	1						1		
	1990	2009	19	Thomas Winslow (Beatrce6)	1					1			
1 NJ	1967	1985	18	Rubin Hurricane Carter	1						1		
	1985	1993	8	Margaret Kelly Michaels	1	1	0						
	1988	2007	19	Byron Halsey	1	1	0						
	1988	2010	22	Paul Kamienski	1	1	0						
	2008	2011	3	Emmanuel Mervilus	1						1		
1 NM	1973	1979	6	Terry Seaton	1	1	0						
	1974	1976	2	Thomas Gladish (NM4)	1					1			
	1974	1976	2	Richard Greet (NM4)	1					1			
	1974	1976	2	Ronald Keine (NM4)	1					1			
	1974	1976	2	Clarence Smith (NM4)	1					1			
1 NV	1982	1996	14	Roberto Miranda	1						1		

1 1	NY	1954	1955	1	Paul Pfeffer	1		1								
		1982	1984	2	Nathaniel Carter	1		1								
		1982	2001	19	Colin Warner	1				1						
		1983	2012	29	Dennis Halstead	1			1							
		1983	2012	29	John Restivo	1			1							
		1985	1987	2	Marion Coakley	1	1	0								
		1985	1990	5	Albert Algerin	1			1							
		1986	1990	4	Jesus Torres	1			1							
		1986	2002	16	Angelo Martinez	1									1	
		1986	2005		John Kogut	1	1	0								
		1989	1992	3	Richard Knupp	1		1								
		1989	1999	10	Timothy Crosby	1		1								
		1989	2009	20 IP	Steven Barnes	1					1					
		1989	2013	24	Derrick Deacon	1				1						
		1990	2003	13	Yusef Salaam (CP Five)	1	1	0								
		1991	2009	18	Fernando Bermudez	1	1	0								
		1990	2002	12	Lamont Branch	1		1								
		1990	2006		Jeffrey Deskovic	1					1					
		1990	2007		Martin Tankleff	1		1								
		1991	2013	22	David Ranta	1	1	0								
		1992	2000	8	Gerald Harris	1		1								
		1992	2010		Frank Sterling	1					1					
		1994	2008	14	Lynn DeJac	1								1		
		1995	2001	6	Arthur Stewart	1		1								
		1995	2007	12	Carlos Cardenas	1		1								
		1995	2007	12	Napoleon Cardenas	1		1								
		1996	2000	4	Patrick Griffin	1	1	0								
		1996	2006	10	Daniel Gristwood	1					1					
		1999	2007	8	Stephen G. Schulz	1		1								
				TOT	29											
1 (		1977	2003	26 CM	Timothy Howard	1		1								
		1977	2003	26 CM	Gary James	1		1								
		1978	1980	2	Floyd Fay	1							1			
		1979	2005		Gary Reece	1	1	0								
		1981	2001	20 CM	Daniel Brown	1		1								
		1991	2002	11	Jimmy Williams	1							1			

		1991	2011	20	IP OH	Roger Dean Gillespie	1	1	0						
		1991	2008	17	IP	Robert McClendon	1						1		
		1994	2009	15	IP OH	Nancy Smith	1	1							
		1994	2009	15	IP OH	Joseph Allen	1			1					
		1997	2013	16		Douglas Prade	1				1				
		1998	2011	13		Thomas Siller	1							1	
		1998	2011	13		Walter Zimmer	1							1	
		1999	2005	6		Clarence Elkins	1			1					
		2003	2012	9		Bryant Gaines	1			1					
					TOT	14									
1	OK	1988	1999	11		Ron Williamson	1		0		1				
		1988	1999	11		Dennis Fritz	1	1	0						
1	OR	1991	1995	4		Laverne Pavlinak (with Sos)	1			1					
		1991	1995	4		John Sosnovske (with Pav)	1		1						
		1999	2002	3		Pamela Reser	1			1					
1	PA	1959	1991	32		Jerry Pacek	1	1							
		1974	2002			Eddie Baker	1	0	1						
		1983	1995	12		Terence McCracken	1		1						
		1988	2005	17		Alfredo Domenech	1		1						
		1988	2005	17		Ivan Serrano	1		1						
		1989	2006	17		Drew Whitley	1				1				
		1992	2011	19		Don Ray Adams	1	1	0						
		1994	2006	12		Tiffany Pritchett	1							1	
1	PR	2000	2009	9		Luis Santaliz Acosta	1	1	0						
1	RI	1996	2002	6	IP NE	Scott Hornoff	1	1	0						
	<b>-</b> >./	10==	100=												
1	TX	1977	1997		CM	Kerry Max Cook	1			1					
		1977	1989	12		Randall Dale Adams	1						1		
		1981	1990	9		Clarence Brandley	1	1	0						
		1982	1984	2		Lenell Geter	1				1				
		1984	1993	9		Federico Macias	1			1					
		1985	1990	5		Martin Kimsey	1		1						

		1987	2004	17		Ernest Ray Willis	1							1			
		1987	2011	24		Michael Morton	1	1	0								
		1989	2002	13		Christopher Ochoa	1	1	0								
		1990	2002	12		Richard Danziger	1			1							
		1991	1992	1		Rickey Dale Thomas	1		1								
		1992	2008	16		Patrick Waller	1				1						
		1992	2010	18		Anthony Graves	1							1			
		1993	2011	18		Tony Hall	1	1	0								
		1995	2009		СМ	Richard Miles	1		1								
		1998	2011	13		Dale Duke	1				1						
		1985	1993	8		Muneer Deeb	1	1	0								
		1992	2005	13		John Michael Harvey	1		1								
		1997	2000	3		Anthony Curlin	1		1								
		1997	2009	12		Christopher Scott	1		1								
		1997	2009	12		Claude Simmons	1		1								
		1997	2013	16		Elizabeth Ramirez, SA4	1		1								
		1998	2013	15		Kristie Mayhugh, SA4	1		1								
		1998	2013	15		Cassandra Rivera, SA4	1		1								
		1998	2013	15		Anna Vasquez, SA4	1		1								
		1998	2001	3		Morris Jones	1				1						
		1999	2009	10		Michael Toney	1			1							
		1999	2011	12		Daniel Roy Settle (Tulia)	1				1						
		1999	2012	13		Kenneth Boyd, Jr.	1	1	0								
		2000	2006	6		Brandy Briggs	1							1			
					TOT	29											
1	UT	1995	2013	18		Debra Brown	1	1	0								
		2004	2007	3		Warren Clifford Hales	1					1					
			-		TOT	1						·					
1	VA	1984	2011	27	IP MD	Thomas Haynesworth	1		1								
		1994	1995	1	2	Christopher E. Prince	1				1					$\dashv$	
		1999	2009	10		Joseph Dick (Norfolk4)	1	1	0		-						
		1999	2009	10		Derek Tice (Norfolk4)	1	1	0								
		1999	2009	10		Danial Williams (Norfolk4)	<u>·</u>	1	0							$\dashv$	
		1999	2009	10		Eric Wilson (Norfolk4)	<u>.</u>	1	0							$\overline{}$	

	2001	2012	11		Michael Hash	1				1					
1 WA	1984	1997	13		Benjamin Harris	1					1				
	1996	2007	11		Ted Bradford	1					1				
1 WI	1972		9		Francis Hemauer	1			1						
	2001	2005	4		Evan Zimmerman	1							1		
1 WV	1950	1960	10		Robert Ballard Bailey	1			1						
1 77 7	1987	1993	6		John Thomas Marvin	1				1					
					<b>LUNTEERED TO TAK</b>				Ή						
OR SCH	EDULE	ED WIT	THOU	T OB	JECTION AND DID NO	OT OC	CU	R							
MA	1983	2001	18		Kenny Waters										
MI	1982	2008	26		Walter Swift										
NC	1988	2012	24		Willie Grimes										
* Ora	anizatio	no													
Olg	CWC		for Wro	naful (	Convictions										
	CM	Centuri			5011110110110										
	IP	Innocei													