

SNOW NOTES

THE WRONGFUL CONVICTION OF JAMIE SNOW AND HOW THEY GOT AWAY WITH IT

Steve Scheel Perspective

Relevant Criminal History:

5/04/1991 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse, McLean County, 3yrs

Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault of a Victim <13, McLean County, 6 yrs

August 8, 1991

Lead Sheet

Scheel called in an anonymous tip that Jamie told Molly Eash that he shot the person at the Clark Station.

February 11, 1993

Major Case Leads Sheet

Scheel's brother reports that while in prison for child molesting, Scheel said that Jamie came to a party he was at around the time of the crime with candy and cigarettes and other stuff, told him he did the Clark Station killing. Hand written notes state "don't know if he said that he did Little or not."

September 8, 1993

Interview with Detectives Charles Crowe and Dan Katz

States that in April of 1991, he and his wife were at a party at Molly & Roy Oesch's house on South Oak St and Jamie told him he did the robbery at the Clark Station on Empire St. He said they spoke in the dining room after Jamie left and returned with marijuana. He said he had known Jamie since he was a young boy and they were just catching up, and Jamie mentioned he was wanted for a robbery, and also mentioned the greyhound bus station robbery, a robbery on S Main St, and the Clark Gas Station robbery. He said he asked him if he shot the boy and he said yes but he didn't think he killed him. He did not mention a weapon or motive or mention any detail. His demeanor was edgy and jumpy but serious. The conversation ended after that. He thinks Molly overheard the conversation because she was standing nearby. He said Jamie appeared rugged, unshaven, with messy hair, and was wearing blue jeans with a blue or black flannel opened over another shirt. He said he told his father about the conversation.

October 12, 1993

Polygraph

Results: Failed

Did Jamie Snow tell you that he robbed the Clark Station On Empire Street? Yes

Did Jamie Snow tell you that he shot the Clark Station attendant? Yes

Are you lying when you say the Jamie Snow told you he shot the Clark Station attendant? No

April 12, 1999

Interview with Detectives Rick Barkes and Dan Katz

States that in April of 1991, he and his wife Tammy were at a party at Molly & Roy Oesch's house on Oak St and Jamie told him he killed the kid at the Clark Gas Station in Bloomington. He cannot remember if the conversation occurred before or after Jamie left to get marijuana. He said they had a conversation in the kitchen dining area. He said he had known Jamie since he was 8 or 9 and they were catching up, he said he was wanted for robbery, and that he shot the kid at the Clark Station. He said he asked him if he shot the kid and he said yes. He said he thought he was exaggerating and did not do the crime, and didn't believe him, and later after he told his father, and that's why he came forward in 1993. He said Jamie gave no further details. He said Molly may have overheard when she walked into the room. He said Jamie was real antsy, nervous, and tense. He was wearing blue jeans and a flannel shirt opened over another shirt. He looked rugged with messed up hair.

January 05, 2001

Snow Trial

Direct Examination Via Charles Reynard

Scheel claims he has known Jamie since six, seven, or eight years old (p 132, line 17).

Scheel admits in 1992 he was convicted of aggravated criminal sexual abuse and aggravated criminal sexual assault (p 132, lines 18-22).

He claims he had last seen Jamie when he was 9 years old, until he saw him at Molly and Roy Esch's home in April of 1991. He says it was a housewarming party and he saw Jamie arrive with Susan Powell. (p 133, lines 12-24 & p 134 lines 2-11).

He describes Jamie as unshowered, grungy, and messy, wearing a black T-shirt with a flannel over it and blue jeans (p 134 lines 20-24 & p 135 lines 1-2).

He claims they had a conversation to catch up on old times and Molly was standing five or six feet away (p 135, lines 8-10).

He confirms the conversation of criminal activities came up and says Jamie said he was on the run for the bus station robbery, which is then objected to and sustained. The jury is told to disregard (p 135, lines 14-24).

The prosecutor approaches the bench and argues that the jury should be instructed they are allowed to hear the claim that Jamie was on the run from the bus station robbery to consider his state of mind, and it is not submitted for evidence that he committed the crime. The defense argues it is prejudicial and the risk outweighs the benefit. The judge sides with the prosecution and instructs the jury to consider it only for interpreting Jamie's state of mind during the alleged conversation (p 135 – 139).

Scheel claims that the Clark Station robbery and murder came up in their conversation, he asked Jamie if he shot the boy, and Jamie said yes. That was the end of the conversation (p 139, lines 6-24).

Cross Examination Via Frank Picl

Scheel confirms that Molly is his niece by marriage and he has not stayed in touch with her since 1992 (p 141, lines 20-23).

Scheel confirms he did prison time for his aggravated criminal sexual assault conviction (p 142 lines 1-5).

Picl comments that Scheel's memory of the party is impressive and it is objected to and sustained (p142, lines 6-2).

Scheel confirms he was drinking but not doing drugs during the conversation with Jamie (p 142, lines 18-21).

Scheel confirms he did not contact the police to report Jamie that night, or within the days after (p 142, lines 22-24 & p 143).

Scheel confirms he can't remember what day of the week the party was on but he can remember exactly what Jamie was wearing, even though he did not take notes or a photo (p 144, lines 14-24 & p 145 line 1).

He confirms he did not contact the police or the State's Attorney within a year after that conversation to report Jamie (p 145, lines 2-11).

Scheel admits he told his father about the conversation and his father said he was going to discuss it with the State's Attorney. He claims he had not been sentenced yet and did not know what his sentence would actually be, just what the mandatory minimum was. He said he did not think about getting a reduced sentence in exchange for his information (p 145, lines 11-24, p 146, lines 1-14).

He admits he told Detective Katz in 1999 that he dismissed what Jamie said at the party and did not believe it (p 146, lines 15-21).

He agrees he is being truthful today, as he is a good citizen (p 146, lines 22-24 & p 147, lines 1-2).

He admits he discussed the alleged conversation with Jamie, with his father, after he was charged for his crimes, and he told no one else prior to being charged. He disagrees that he was not a good citizen for not coming forward prior (p 147, lines 4-20).

He confirms that the Reverend William Gaddis is his cousin on his mother's side, he hasn't spoken to him in years, and does not know if he is a member at his church (p 147, lines 21-24 & p 148, lines 1-6).

He says the conversation he had with Jamie took 15 – 20 minutes, but the part about the crimes only took a couple minutes (p 149, lines 1-17).

He agrees that he told Detective Katz in 1993 that the conversation only took 5 – 10 minutes, but insists it still could have been up to 20 minutes. Picl responds he doesn't have the energy to clarify and has no other questions (p 149, lines 22-24 & p 150, lines 1-19).

Redirect via Charles Reynard

Scheel says the reason he recalls Jamie's appearance so well was because he was surprised to see him in an unkempt condition (p 151, lines 1-6).

Scheel claims his cases were never even discussed with the police after his father gave them his information. He confirms he had a trial and did not take a plea bargain (p 151, lines 7-22).

Scheel confirms he did not know the remarks made to Detective Katz about his interpretation of Jamie's truthfulness was significant (p 151, lines 23-24 & p 152, lines 1-4).

Recross via Frank Picl

Scheel confirms that he hadn't seen Jamie in 13 years, but yet was still able to form an opinion about his appearance (p 152, lines 18-21).

Scheel confirms he is indeed testifying that after not seeing Jamie for 13 years, he confessed to shooting and killing someone (p 152, lines 22-24 & p 153, line 1).

January 05, 2001

Snow Trial

Molly Eads Direct Examination Via Teena Griffin

Molly confirms that she lived in an apartment on North Oak in the spring of 1991 with her husband Roy Esch. She confirms Scheel is her relative (p 91, line 24, p 92, & p 93, line 1).

She confirms she knew of Jamie snow, had seen him, but had no association (p 93, lines 2-6).

She confirms she knew Bill Little was shot and killed at the Clark Gas Station in spring of 1991 and she had a party at her apartment after the shooting, where Scheel, Susan Claycomb, and Jamie were present, but before her June 6th birthday (p 93, lines 18-24, p 94, lines 1-9, & p 95, lines 13-18).

She says she vaguely remembers Jamie wearing a flannel shirt and he had long hair (p 95, lines 22-24 & p 96, line 1).

Cross Examination via Frank Picl

Picl only asks Molly if there was a party with people drinking, which she affirms, and then denies drug use. She is excused. (p 96, lines 7-21)

September 01, 2005

Investigator Anthony Matens Affidavit

Matens describes interviewing Scheel on September 1, 2005. He reported Scheel denied any personal knowledge of the murder of Bill Little before Detective Crowe approached him. After they met, Crowe fed him information. Scheel said he took a polygraph proving he had no knowledge. He said while he was on parole, Detective Dan Katz approached him and said he was lying and going to be in big trouble. He said he had no actual knowledge of what he testified to at Jamie's trial and it was false.

January 26, 2010

Investigator Larry Biela Affidavit

Biela describes interviewing Scheel on December 22, 2009 for several hours, at his home in Arkansas with defense attorney Tara Thompson. He reported Scheel was very emotional, crying, and shaking, saying he felt guilty because he was part of the reason Jamie was serving so much time when he was innocent. He said the testimony he gave against Jamie at trial was false.

Scheel said he was afraid of the BPD and McLean County State's Attorney. He said he did see Jamie at a party in 1990 or 1991 at Molly Eash's house but Jamie did not say anything about a gas station shooting or Bill Little, he never confessed.

Scheel said during an interview in either 1995 or 1996, he told Detectives Katz and Crowe that it was not true Jamie confessed to him. He said they told him they did not like his answers and kept stopping and rewinding the tape to rerecord.

Scheel said when he took the polygraph a month later, he answered that Jamie did not confess, that he did not answer in the affirmative as recorded.

Scheel said he was put into segregation in prison and thought the police working this case were responsible for it.

Scheel said after his parole, Katz visited him at his parole office, said he wanted him to say Jamie confessed, and said the police composite from the murder actually looked like Scheel himself. He said he denied that Jamie confessed, but they kept rewinding the tape and rerecording, so he felt he had no choice but to cooperate, so he said Jamie confessed to him, even though it was not true.

Scheel said that Katz and Reynard contacted him again in 1999 and agreed to stop harassing him if he testified at Jamie's trial. He said he was subpoenaed and received money to travel to the trial. He said before he took the stand, Reynard and Katz planned his testimony with him, and told him to say what Jamie was wearing that night and that he appeared shaggy. He said he had no actual idea what he was wearing though.

Scheel said that before the trial, no one from the defense interviewed him.

Scheel denied to sign a statement after discussing it with his wife, due to fear of being charged with perjury.