

1 committed serious crimes, but he stands to gain nothing from  
2 his testimony here years later that this defendant admitted  
3 to him at a party that he was on the run for several <sup>Other BAD</sup> ~~several~~ <sup>ACTS</sup>  
4 robberies and that he committed the Clark station robbery.

5 Did he kill the kid at the Clark station, Scheel asked this  
6 defendant, and the defendant said yes, he did. <sup>I SAID</sup> <sup>No</sup> <sup>check</sup>

7 Scheel does stand to lose, however, if he commits <sup>Scheel</sup> <sup>testimony</sup>  
8 perjury here on the witness stand telling you things that  
9 aren't true. But they are true. Indeed, Molly Eades  
10 corroborates Steve Scheel's testimony by confirming that, in  
11 fact, she did have this gathering at her home during this  
12 time frame before the defendant took off for Missouri. And  
13 within days of this gathering the defendant runs to  
14 Missouri, corroborating by his own actions what Steve Scheel  
15 said indeed he was on the run, and he hides in his sister's  
16 attic when the police come for him.

17 This defendant told Bruce Roland that he shot Bill  
18 Little when they were together at the Logan Correctional  
19 Center for one month in December of 1994. And what details  
20 did Roland provide. The group had been partying at the  
21 Whitmer's three or four houses north on Linden. He went for  
22 cigarettes at the station, got into an argument with the  
23 clerk, went back later to get his cigarettes, to take care  
24 of business, and he shot the kid, took the money, and they

1 left. Was this the earlier time that Gutierrez described?  
2 Did Roland get together with Mr. Gutierrez to invent this  
3 disagreement between the defendant and Bill Little? Yes,  
4 Roland admitted he hopes his information helps in his  
5 pending case, but he's been made no promises, received no  
6 consideration.

7 And in response to Roland, the defendant says, he  
8 wasn't in segregation, but the facts show and the records  
9 from the Department of Corrections show that, indeed, he was  
10 in a segregation unit used to transport -- used for  
11 transports. In further response the defendant denies he was  
12 on the circuit, like Roland says. But the issue here is  
13 when he told Roland he was on the circuit, not whether he  
14 was. Indeed, he was only at Logan for a short, brief time.  
15 Why wouldn't Roland believe the defendant when he said he  
16 was on the circuit when the defendant was puffing himself up  
17 as a big time bad actor, someone who was on the circuit,  
18 moved from place to place? Why would Roland invent this  
19 detail if it could be so easily disproved? On the other  
20 hand, if he heard what he heard and the defendant was just  
21 BSing again, as defense counsel kept asking his friends  
22 whether he did, then once again, you know who to believe.

23 How is it that Roland got information from the  
24 defendant, the same information that Ed Hammond got from the