


Misidentification

The witnesses in this case did not see who had set this fire. Their identifications are based on a fight that was alleged to have taken place the day before with a person name "Rick". These witnesses were shown a photo array which contained Gwynn's photo (we don't know how Gwynn's photo became the subject of this arson investigation), and 4 out of 6 witnesses identified Gwynn's photo. The witnesses' initial descriptions of "Rick" were a far cry from Gwynn's likeness; there's no corroborating evidence that they even knew Gwynn; and they've ID'd another man as "Rick". Only 2 out of the 4 witnesses who made a photo ID, made an ID of Gwynn as "Rick" at his trial.

The photo arrays these witnesses ID'd Gwynn from are missing as well as the arrays from the Lupton case (where Gwynn's photo is alleged to have been retrieved from). Without these photo arrays, Gwynn is unable to effectively challenge the identification proceedings. These witnesses identified Lupton as "Rick" in that case, where Gwynn is alleged to have been just a filler, and there's no record of these witnesses directing the police to Gwynn's photo in that case.

The witnesses that gave a description of "Rick" and ID'd Gwynn in the arson investigation photo array, all missed key details that would've matched Gwynn in their descriptions of "Rick". Also, their statements of prior familiarity of Gwynn lacks pointed knowledge about him, which questions the reliability of their accounts & ID's: Fact that Gwynn was hospitalized in early 94', wore a cast for months; that he was in county lock up twice in 94'; was never on probation; and that Gwynn had a prominent facial scar. Gwynn's 94' time line makes it impossible for him having lived with these people as they've stated.



Daniel Gwynn Blog Update

Date: 10/21/13

Subject: "Misidentification"

Misidentification (cont.)

The same witnesses that testified in both cases (Lupton & Gwynn) gave statements as eyewitnesses to two different crimes at roughly the same time, and stated that the perpetrator was a man they only knew as "Rick". In each case, they ID'd "Rick" on the basis of photographs shown by the police. Yet they ID'd two different men (Lupton & Gwynn). Neither one of these men has ever been known by anyone else as "Rick". The prosecution has never explained why the photographs from which the squatters identified Gwynn (& Lupton) have not been disclosed to Gwynn. The witnesses stated that "Rick" had recently been released from prison, and was currently on probation. Gwynn had never been imprisoned prior to this arson case, which means he hasn't been on probation.

Wherefore, as made evident here, Gwynn could not be the perpetrator known as "Rick", as the witnesses ID's & statements prove to be full of discrepancies & unreliable, Gwynn does not match the initial description given, there's no corroborating evidence Gwynn was ever known as "Rick", and there was another man from a different case they ID'd as "Rick".

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel Gwynn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, decorative flourish at the end.