

CREATING THE PERFECT EYEWITNESS - PART TWO

The first police officer on the scene of the murder took a collective description from the four eyewitnesses. They were all certain, they seen commit the murder was a white male with dark brown hair. This is important to note, because this police officer was never questioned by any of the three defense attorneys assigned to represent me. Even more important is the fact the prosecuting attorneys apparently never questioned this police officer, or had access to his reports. As the prosecuting attorneys told the jury over ten times that never once did the eyewitnesses waiver or vary in their description of the person they seen that night. The law states that even if police withhold favorable evidence from the prosecution the prosecution is still held accountable for this misconduct. Since it is the prosecutions duty to insure justice is served, and guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay - there is more. One of the eyewitnesses who was certain the person she seen was white, with dark hair. Drew a composite drawing of the person she seen for a detective. Yet, this detective was never questioned by any of the defense attorneys, nor was the composite drawing preserved as evidence. Apparently the prosecution did not know about this detective, or about the composite drawing. You can believe if the composite drawing was of a dark complexioned, non white looking male with long black hair and a full beard. It would have been preserved by the police and given to the prosecution. Another example of withheld favorable evidence is shown through one of the prosecutions main police witnesses. A detective who not only failed to turn over tape-recorded statements he took from the three eyewitnesses he interviewed. In which they all state with certainty the person they seen was a white male with dark hair, and one stated possibly having a

CREATING THE PERFECT EYEWITNESS - PART THREE

Putting all the pieces together in a comprehensive manner, to find help, to correct the injustice I suffer, is my purpose in writing this blog. Three of the four eyewitnesses were manipulated into changing their initial description of the person they seen, 180 degrees, and then allowed to testify that I was the person they seen commit murder. While never being challenged on the how, and why, they changed their perceptions of what they initially reported seeing. My right to put these witnesses to true adversarial testing was denied me, because I had no way of showing they did change their description of the person they initially stated, with certainty having seen. Again, the eyewitness initial statements were withheld/concealed to keep me from pointing^{to} this disparity. I do not blame the eyewitness^s, and commend one eyewitness for testifying she was unable to identify me as the person she seen. Even though the jury never heard her testimony. I do hold the prosecution accountable for the misconduct that took place in withholding the favorable evidence disputing the eyewitness testimony. The eyewitnesses were unwittingly turned into dupes, and victims themselves in what I have identified as a criminal enterprise operating within the ranks of Florida's criminal justice system. Which I will expound on in future blog entries. As there are unjustifiable reasons why the two prosecuting, and three defense attorneys have not come forward to vindicate me. Making it all the more imperative upon me to take my time in writing comprehensively. Those guilty of obstructing justice (racketeering) have to be brought to justice, and shown how their criminal actions have rendered Florida's use of the death penalty untrustworthy. Please express your support through posting comments, and by direct correspondence. Thank you!

Respectfully,

Milo Rose