1	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
2	MCLEAN COUNTY, ILLINOIS
3	PEOPLE OF THE) STATE OF ILLINOIS)
4 5) Plaintiff,)
6 7 8	vs.) NO. 99 CF 1016 JAMES CHRISTOPHER SNOW,) Defendant.)
9	<u>HEARING</u>
10	REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of the hearing before the
11	Honorable DONALD D. BERNARDI on the 7th day of November,
12	2008.
13	APPEARANCES:
14 15	MR. WILLIAM WORKMAN, Assistant State's Attorney for McLean County, for the People of the State of Illinois;
16	MS. TARA THOMPSON,
17	Attorney at Law, for the Defendant;
18	Defendant also present.
19	
20	
21	Nancy L. McClarty, CSR, CP-RPR
22	CSR License No. 084-002264 Official Court Reporter
23 24	McLean County, IL

THE COURT: We'll go on the record, 99 CF 1016.

The People appear by Mr. Workman. And Mr. Snow appears along with Miss Thompson.

2.2

2.3

We had set this over today for, as I recall it was really a -- well, it looks like we initially set it for hearing on the motion. So maybe I'll ask Mr. Workman what the status is.

MR. WORKMAN: Your Honor, I have had contact with the Illinois State Police crime lab, and they have indicated to me that they do, in fact, do post-conviction testing all the time. They would have no problem with working on this case. Although they have indicated that there are some parameters, and a couple of the items that we did, in fact, talk about that were requested, the State Police crime lab said that that either couldn't be done or it at least is not feasible in their lab. They didn't know that it would be feasible in any lab. I'm specifically talking about the bullets on that regard.

THE COURT: Okay. So, there are a number of items that you can identify and you and Miss Thompson have already identified those items. That's part of what we were doing?

MR. WORKMAN: Yeah, we did meet and see what they had at the Bloomington police evidence locker.

THE COURT: And there is at least a couple of items

- that Miss Thompson can explore another resource if she thinks
 that someone else can test those?

 MR. WORKMAN: That's correct.
 - MR. WORKMAN: The lab says they can't, and they actually said that they didn't think given the technology today that any other lab would be able to.

THE COURT: But the lab says they can't?

- 8 THE COURT: All right.
- 9 MR. WORKMAN: But --

4

5

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- 10 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
- 11 MR. WORKMAN: They're free to explore that
 12 possibility.
 - THE COURT: So is the status of the motion from your side then that it's not really contested other than to identify these exhibits as we said and --
 - MR. WORKMAN: That would be correct. And they did -- the lab did indicate that on these types of hearings they do ask that the items submitted be limited to five to ten items. They did give some parameters.
 - I haven't had a chance to talk to Miss Thompson yet about those. I just found out about those. But I do have some parameters that they are wanting to go by, and I think, for example, there was the discussion about the blood stain on the floor that was found next to the counter. The crime

lab said that would be no problem. Being in '91, they didn't do DNA testing on that. They just did the blood typing, so that is a possibility of having work done on it.

2.2

2.3

The clothing for touch-transfer DNA possibilities are available. That's also a possibility. They just ask that those items be limited.

They also indicated that due to their workload, which is one of the concerns that I had, they said that they ask that it be recognized that this would be put into their regular course of the examinations that they do. They said it would probably take at least three to six months, probably on the latter part, the six-month period. They also indicated that there has to be an agreement of consumption of any materials that are going to be used and be tested and because of the way that they put it into the regular course, they don't have on these types of cases an independent watching done.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that was one of the questions we had last time. So you're telling me that the lab doesn't require someone else to observe?

MR. WORKMAN: That's exactly right. Actually, I think they specifically asked that it not happen.

THE COURT: All right. And, as you understand it, are we over the number that they've asked --

MR. WORKMAN: We had a large number of items that were looked at and discovered. I haven't been -- we haven't talked any further about which ones they specifically want, but I would just bring that out that if it needs to be limited, if the defense has a -- specific items that they want to highlight or look at.

2.2

2.3

There was also some discussions in this motion about fingerprints, and I would also indicate to the court and to counsel on the fingerprints, on the processing of those fingerprints, specifically whether or not they would be put into AFIS, back in '91 when these prints were taken, they were put into AFIS and because this is a homicide case, those prints are never removed from AFIS, so they've been in AFIS the whole time. They are constantly generating some type of a match to see if there is a match to these fingerprints. So that part of the request is -- actually has been complied with since 1991. It's still in there. It's an ongoing thing.

THE COURT: Well, I think it's -- that's only part of the request. I'm sure Miss Thompson wants a report on that to show that, but I think if you can generate that, that probably you're right, would satisfy that.

MR. WORKMAN: I think I can. I talked to the same individual that did the -- on the fingerprint analysis.

1 Chris Jacobson is the individual that I spoke with, and he's
2 the one that actually did the work on the original prints
3 that were submitted.

THE COURT: All right.

2.2

2.3

MR. WORKMAN: He's still there at the crime lab.

THE COURT: So your understanding today is that one of two things is going to happen. You're either going to have an agreement upwards of ten exhibits that are going to go to the lab, or you're going to have a request from

Miss Thompson -- I'll hear from her in a moment -- that some number in excess of that is being asked to go to the lab, and you may need a hearing to resolve that issue. Does that sound right to you?

MR. WORKMAN: That would be correct.

THE COURT: And then you can -- you can resolve the fingerprint issue because you can get a current report as to the -- first you've got to identify those exhibits I guess, but that they have been run by the lab so at least that part of the request can be granted and complied with then, correct?

MR. WORKMAN: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. So, Miss Thompson, what's -- what are you suggesting we do given all of this information?

 $\,$ MS. THOMPSON: Well, I'm obviously -- this is the first that I'm hearing about the report from the crime lab. In terms of --

THE COURT: Which report?

2.2

2.3

MS. THOMPSON: In terms of sort of everything that Mr. Workman has just said about what the lab has indicated about possibilities of testing, their parameters for the number, so I haven't had an opportunity to discuss these issues with my client I guess is what I'm saying. I believe and, you know, we can -- I can talk about this or give my argument about this further with Your Honor that we really are entitled to testing of all these items.

If it's an issue with the crime lab in terms of submitting a certain number first, I'm happy to, you know, work with the lab about the parameters about what we're going to submit initially and to see what the rulings are from that evidence. But in terms of there being some limit under the statute as to the number of items we're allowed to have tested, there isn't any sort of limit in the statute just from a numerical perspective. If Your Honor wants to comply with that indication from the lab about a certain number first, then I'm happy to work with Mr. Workman to determine, you know, what items that's going to be initially.

In terms of the fingerprints and AFIS, as Your

Honor suggested, there can be a report from -- from Chris

Jacobson or if Chris Jacobson is willing to speak to me about

these issues, I'm willing to talk to him or her in person to

determine what the issues are to satisfy ourselves that what

we are seeking has already been done.

2.3

And finally, the issue of the bullet testing, I believe that DNA testing is possible on those items. I'm happy to, if Your Honor wants to defer ruling on the entire motion until we can present further evidence, I'm happy to do that. If you want to order testing on the other items and present an affidavit after consulting with experts about how that can be accomplished, I'm happy to do things that way, too.

THE COURT: Well, you know, so far on this entire motion, I've not been asked to decide anything, as you know. And that's because essentially the State is really not objecting to the request other than to the extent now they're talking about some limitations at the lab, okay.

So, if you believe that there is an alternative lab that can do everything that you want that can take more than ten, then the only question is whether or not the State's either willing to agree to that or if that lab will accept someone to observe if the State's willing to provide that, but, you know, I'm guessing and my memory is that you said

you don't have a particular objection to the crime lab except that, you know, now we're getting these limitations. Is that correct?

2.2

2.3

MS. THOMPSON: That's correct, Your Honor. And my understanding, although you know I'm happy to investigate this further and report back to the court with more specific information, is that the state crime lab is currently contracting out with Cellmark, which is a private DNA lab, to do a lot of their DNA testing. I don't know if they would contract this particular case out or not, but my understanding is Cellmark is able to do the kinds of testing that we're requesting. And I need to get an affidavit or something from someone there obviously to make that representation to the court more firmly, but that is my understanding at this point.

THE COURT: Well, it strikes me that this is all in your hands and that of Mr. Workman because so far I've not been asked to either order the lab to do more than the ten or I've not been asked to do anything, and, you know, I really don't want to set another hearing if we're going to come back with just more unresolved issues. I mean the two of you have got to decide what you want me to decide because if I'm being asked by Miss Thompson to order the state crime lab to analyze 22 items, then that's one issue, and Mr. Workman can

respond as to whether I have the authority to do that. But, you know, right now this is very much in your hands, and I appreciate that you just heard about it today, but I guess what I'm suggesting is that the two of you can't come into court and just tell me that we haven't resolved anything. I mean that's why we moved it over to today, and, you know, we're not moving this ball at all. I mean this is already a long-standing petition, and I'd like it to at least be in a position where it's going to get resolution one of these days.

2.2

2.3

I mean it sounds like we've got partial resolution with the fingerprints, but we don't with the rest of the crime lab material. So we have to decide what lab is going to do it, and if the two of you can agree with what number the lab is going to do, then it's an agreed order coming to me.

If you can't do that, then, Miss Thompson, you can pursue an alternative lab, and then the shoe is on the other foot. You have to consult with Mr. Workman about whether or not the State can live with the transport to them. But, it's not -- it's just not very helpful to not have an issue for the court to resolve.

So, I think that I need an estimate from you,
Miss Thompson. It sounds like you're the one who wants to

investigate the possibility of an alternate lab, some time frame that you think you're going to need to get that answered, because once you determine the status of the bullet rounds and whether or not they can be tested and once you've checked for an alternate lab, then things start to fall in place.

If you don't have an alternate lab, then this might be done piecemeal, as you suggested. We might send out by agreement a group of exhibits and see what that result is, and then maybe there will be an argument at that time as to whether additional ones should be sent out, but at least the process can be started.

MS. THOMPSON: I agree --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

2.2

2.3

MS. THOMPSON: Sorry. I agree with Your Honor, and certainly my client's interest is in resolving this as quickly as possible. My preference would actually be not to do this piecemeal. As Your Honor said, I'd rather not be coming back here to resolve bits and pieces of it. I would rather just figure out what we can do and resolve the entire issue.

So what I would do is consult with Cellmark, and my understanding is normally they require 30 days to do a consultation about a potential DNA testing for evidence; and

so I guess I would ask for maybe 45 days to be able to consult with them and then consult with my client and Mr. Workman so we can come back and either let the court know that we've been able to resolve this or that we definitively haven't and leave it up to the court to make a ruling.

2.2

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Well, is that all right with you then, Mr. Workman?

MR. WORKMAN: Yeah, that's fine with me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Here is what I'm going to suggest we do then. I would just prefer that the -- that Miss Thompson have the 45 days to consult. And then a period of time after that where you and Mr. Workman have got to decide what you're going to want the court to decide, and then there has to be a written filing to that effect because I don't want to come back here with either of you giving new Cellmark information on the defense side or new state lab information on the State side because the next time we come into court, we ought to try to resolve the pending motion with an order that Exhibits A, B, C, and D, whatever they may be, are going to be examined by whom and what the conditions are. And I suspect that I'll hear from Miss Thompson that the fingerprint issue is resolved because Mr. Workman got that ordered. So that just leaves the DNA issues. So I guess what I'm suggesting

1 | to you is I'm going to want something in writing.

Bob, do you want to -- I guess the book is not -- why don't you get the book, anyway.

THE CLERK: Okay.

2.2

2.3

MR. WORKMAN: I have a couple other points I'd like to bring out, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, let me get -- does it have anything to do about the timing?

MR. WORKMAN: No.

THE COURT: Okay, go ahead, you can do it.

MR. WORKMAN: I just wanted to advise the court one of the issues that we were looking at was the 911 tape, whether or not it existed or not. When Miss Thompson and I were looking together through the evidence, we also went back to my office, looked through the tapes and stuff that we had in our office and we did actually find one. I have attempted to reproduce it for her in electronic form. I've been able to download it on to my computer, but for some reason the computer will not put it on to any other material, like a compact disk or anything, but I was able to e-mail that to her so we have resolved that issue on the 911, that portion of it anyway whether any of it existed, and we did find I think there is about eight minutes of tape there.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WORKMAN: Additionally, I would actually also point out as to the fingerprint portion of it, looking at the motion that the defendant's filed under page four on the exhibits or actually I guess it's Exhibit Four, the second paragraph indicates that the AFIS evaluation was done and it continues, so I mean there is already actually a report there that shows the fingerprints are put into AFIS and they remain there for verification purposes.

2.2

2.3

THE COURT: Yes, I think all I would want if this were a contested issue is something from Jacobson indicating how often they run it and the last time they ran it and what the results were, and I think -- I don't know that there is much more that you can do. I didn't realize that that was a continuous process when they -- when they put them in, which is probably a good thing.

MR. WORKMAN: I didn't realize that either until I was -- spoke to Mr. Jacobson.

MS. THOMPSON: And, Your Honor, one point on that.

I guess if it is going to be a report from Mr. Jacobson, I would like to know how often they intend to continue to run that in the future.

THE COURT: Yes, so would I. If I were getting it, I would like to know that, too, so hopefully Mr. Workman will have that explanation put in there. I think that's good to

1 know whether it's annually or how often they run the unknowns.

2.2

2.3

MR. WORKMAN: I -- I will find out for sure, Your Honor, but I think it's just those prints are in the AFIS system and anytime a new print is put in --

THE COURT: It checks for a match.

MR. WORKMAN: It checks everything.

THE COURT: Which means it's happening daily.

MR. WORKMAN: Continuously.

THE COURT: Well, that's fine.

MR. WORKMAN: But I'll get that in writing.

THE COURT: If we look at 45 days, Miss Thompson, it's, you know, close to the end of December for you to do the lab check, and then I would like to choose a time frame where the two of you need to consult and provide a written response to the court indicating what the issues remain for resolution, okay? That's what I'm looking for.

MS. THOMPSON: If it's acceptable to Your Honor, I think we planned, and to Mr. Workman, I think I plan on coming in with an agreed order or a motion from the defendant on what specific testing we're seeking.

THE COURT: That's perfect because all I want next time is that whoever takes it over knows what it is that needs to be decided. So, the question is after you have this

```
1
      45-day period to check the lab, how many days do you want to
 2
      talk to Mr. Workman and get your motion, if you need it, on
 3
      file?
                MS. THOMPSON: I think two additional weeks would
 4
     be sufficient for that.
 5
                THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Workman, does that
 6
      sound okay to you?
 7
 8
                MR. WORKMAN: Yeah, that's fine, Your Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: Then I'm going to give you 30
10
      additional days to get a motion on file. And you know what,
11
      that can be a motion from either side, of course.
12
                All right, let's take a couple of minutes then and
13
      let me see if I can get you a new date and a courtroom and
14
      everything, okay?
15
                MS. THOMPSON:
                              Okay.
16
                THE COURT: So let's hold on for just a couple of
17
     minutes.
18
                                (Recess.)
19
                THE COURT: Back on the record, 99 CF 1016.
20
      Parties appear same as before.
21
                Here is what we're going to do. I'm going to give
22
      you a date in January which fits with the time frames I've
2.3
      suggested to you or I can give you either the 15th or the
24
      16th and that would be a Thursday or a Friday. It needs to
```

1 be in the morning, so, I can give you like an 11 o'clock. 2 It's the end of the week. Even if it's a jury 3 week, Mr. Workman, it's at least a chance that you'll be out. MR. WORKMAN: On Thursday and Fridays we generally 4 have other stuff scheduled on jury weeks so either one of 5 those days will be fine. 6 7 THE COURT: Here, we'll do 11 o'clock. Does it 8 make any difference, Miss Thompson, to you? 9 MS. THOMPSON: No. 10 THE COURT: All right, 11:00 a.m. on January 15th. 11 It's going to be in front of Judge Lawrence right now. I 12 have no idea -- it will be reassigned, but Judge Robb is gone 13 so I couldn't get you a judge. So, I'm going to set it first 14 in courtroom 3D. I need to have something for the writ, and 15 I will make sure that Judge Robb knows that this is 16 scheduled. 17 At worst it may just be a judge and a courtroom 18 change, but we can get that solved for you. But at least 19 then she would do an assignment so you'll know exactly who 20 has got it. 21 Do you have the writ, Bob? 22 THE CLERK: Yes. 2.3 MR. WORKMAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor, what was the 24 date?

1	THE COURT: It's 1-15 at 11, and it will be in 3D.
2	Anything further?
3	MR. WORKMAN: Nothing by the people.
4	THE COURT: Miss Thompson?
5	MS. THOMPSON: Just one other thing for the record,
6	although he did find the portion of the 911 the prosecutor
7	had, I am going to subpoena the full 911 tape. I just wanted
8	to put it on the record, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: That's fine. I would prefer that these
10	issues get resolved definitively. So if you do that and it
11	doesn't exist and the portion you've got is the only portion,
12	then it's been answered and resolved.
13	So I'm just going to show then on the docket 1-15
14	at 11. See you all back on that day. Thank you.
15	MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	(Which were all the proceedings had in the
17	hearing of the above cause on said date.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
MCLEAN COUNTY, ILLINOIS
I, Nancy L. McClarty, an Official Court Reporter
and Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the Eleventh
Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify
that I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings and
that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my
shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.
Mancy Freclarty
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 084-002264
Dated this 10th day
of May, 2021