

CREATING THE PERFECT EYEWITNESS

PART ONE

During the closing arguments of my trial. The prosecuting attorney stressed over ten times to the jury that never once did the eyewitnesses waiver or vary in their identification of me as the person they seen commit murder. Here were three eyewitnesses swearing under oath that I was the person they watched commit murder, and my only defense was to maintain they were mistaken. What made the eyewitness testimony even more compelling was everyone knew I was the only dark complexioned male with long black hair and a full beard in the entire county. I stood out like a sore thumb - day or night - and the prosecuting attorneys did not want the jury to overlook that fact. So why have the two prosecuting and three defense attorneys, refused to come forward to address the favorable evidence that surfaced after my conviction? Revealing the eyewitnesses did waiver and vary one hundred and eighty degrees from their initial description of the person they were certain committed the murder. The fact this favorable evidence disputing the eyewitness testimony surfaced to reveal it was willfully withheld by two police detectives. Should fill each one of the five trial level attorneys with the same indignation, I feel as an innocent railroad^{ed} for murder. Yet, here I sit on death row thirty years later and these five attorneys refuse to come forward to correct the injustice they supposably (unwittingly) took part in. Leaving me to ask the all important question: Why? Which is the question I hope you members on the court of public opinion will ask out loud, and help me get an answer to... more details on how the eyewitness cover-up profoundly prejudiced me in my next entries.

Respectfully,

Milo Rose