

Episode 11



Season 1 : E11 - Bridge Over Troubled Robber: Ed Hammond

June 3, 2020

Speakers: Bruce Fischer, Jamie Snow, Tammy Alexander, Lesley Pires, Ray Wilson

Episode Description: In 1996, bank robber Ed Hammond was sitting in prison, concerned about a looming 10-year federal sentence. He had a cell mate the year before who had gossiped about Jamie Snow and recently flipped. So when the police came knocking, asking him for information, he knew just what to say.

Hammond fabricated an entire relationship with Jamie, who was then a stranger to him. He took the stand, admitted he had a bad history, but said that since this was the first time he ever snitched, the jury should trust him as much as Jamie did when he confessed. This eleventh episode of Snow Files shows you exactly what the feds are willing to give, and the lengths McLean County was willing to go to close the case.

Music Intro: Injustice Anywhere presents Snow Files: The wrongful conviction of Jamie Snow and how they got away with it.

The mission of the Snow Files podcast is to expose the misconduct at the State's Attorney's Office under Charles Reynard. It is not our intention in any way to disparage the current State's Attorney's Office or the Bloomington Police Department.

Jamie Snow: Hey! Hey, everybody. Before I get going this week on the guy that we're going to talk about, I want to read you guys something that I found in a book my

friend Sue sent me. Sue Thorne, who also has a husband in prison in Ohio. Free David Thorne I think is his website. She, she sent me the book. It's actually a good book. As I got into it, I realized that it was a, I had actually seen the story before, I think it was Oprah Winfrey or something, you know, don't tell nobody I watch Oprah Winfrey, by the way. She sent me a book called What Set Me Free: The True Story of Wrongful Conviction. You know, he wrote, the author's note, he wrote in here, it said,

"I have chosen in writing my book to name only the heroes. In most instances, I've simply omitted the names. In the case of my accuser, I've changed her name, in part, and I will admit, because I don't care to see her name in my book. I did this because this is a story of what set be free, not who wronged me. And what's most important in my story is not the false accusations, or the action of any individual in the criminal justice system, even those who may have been trying to do the right thing, couldn't. Because of the deeply flawed American criminal justice system that was trying to convict me and destroy my life, even after I left prison. It is this system that deserves the blame. But more important, it's that we focus on the reforms that will ensure that it does provide justice for all those who are not yet set free."

I just wanted to share that with y'all because, you know, I think that's a pretty powerful statement, you know, and it's kind of like what we've tried to say all along, you know. My wrongful conviction is as much, even more so in my opinion, falls at the feet of the state. I mean the state did this. The flawed criminal justice system did this. So, it's a universal thing and I think that's a pretty powerful statement from that guy.

So anyways, this week, I guess we're going to talk about a guy named Ed Hammond. Ed was, again, someone who came in and testified that, you know, he'd known me all my life and and, you know, we hung around or whatever, and we didn't, you know, I didn't know who Ed was. And there were many chances along the line from the very beginning, that, had my attorneys had done their due diligence, and had the state done their due diligence, and they may have done their due diligence, but just didn't care. There were many instances along the way where, the fact that he was he was lying, you know, could have been discovered. He gave a statement.

You know, his very first statement to the police. You know, he said that him, and myself and Ed Palumbo were in the county jail together. And the conversation came up and Ed Palumbo started talking about the Clark station homicide. And I put the

kabosh to it, you know. I told Ed to shut up. You know, that was a complete and total lie. I mean, we were never together in the county jail, and it was one of the things that I tried to get my attorneys to get the records, you know, get the housing records for the county jail. I've even tried to get them in the last, you know, 20 years, I've tried to get them. But, you know, the housing records would have showed the three of us were never be together anywhere.

And in his original, his original statement, Ed Hammond to throw some other guy, named Troy Maes, under the bus. He gave a statement saying that Troy was, you know, involved in in the homicide, you know, that he was a driver, or something along those lines. He later on, in a later, later statement, he backed off of that and was like yeah, well, you know, I lied about that. It's kind of like, you know, Randy Howard and some of these other people. I mean, if if you're going to lie about something that doesn't even matter, you know, like Bill Moffat saying that, you know, he couldn't write a letter and and you know, he couldn't use the phone and and you know, he was in a maximum security prison for 80 something days and never saw a guard. I mean, if you're, if you're going to lie about the things that don't matter, then, is, how can you believe anything you say?

But anyways, you know, Ed, Ed went on to say that, you know, we were, years later we were in the same institution together and we just happened to run into each other one day at the B of I. And that's, that short for the Bureau of Identification. And what that is, it's like an office where, whenever you get to an institution, they, you go there and they take your pictures, they get all of your information, they, you know, they get your fingerprints and it's just like, you're, you're being booked into the institution, like if you're, you know, you're going to jail. That's what they do, they take your picture, they take your prints, that's what it is. It's the B of I, you know, it's the Bureau of identification.

And his story, you know, was that he didn't even know that we were in the same institution together until we just happened to run into each other at the B of I. You know, when I, I read that, I was like, I can prove that, you know, this, this is totally false. We were never add the Bureau of Identification together, you know? And there's no, there's absolutely there's a record of it, you know, and had the state had done their, their due diligence they would have, and who's to say they didn't, you know, had they had gotten the records, they would have seen that. We were never at the B of I together, you know? And he said, you know, that we ran into each other at the B of I and that I told him to meet me on the yard. You know, and we were in, we

were in different housing units, we went to different yards. But, you know, he testified that he, you know, within this prison, and he snuck over to the yard where I was at. And he went on to say, on cross examination, I think they asked him, they were like, well, you know, how long would these conversations take place and he said, you know, a minute or two at a time. You know, had my attorneys had done their due diligence, they could have gotten the, you know, they could have gotten a subpoena for the Bureau of Identification records and it would have showed that we will never at the B of I together. So, if we were never at the B of I together, then you know, I, you know, in the yard and that's where, that's where his story fails.

I mean, it's kind of like Randy Howard, you know, I called him on the phone to come pick me up at the bus station. I didn't have a phone and I didn't have a car so you know, his story fails in the beginning. It's kind of like that with Ed Hammond. We have since found out through the Freedom of Information form, you know, filing a Freedom of Information request, we've, we've since found out that, you know, he actually had a pending armed robbery charge they didn't tell us about. And that he got he got a deal on it. We've been trying to, to get the transcripts from the hearing that he, he got this downward departure on this federal case in return for his testimony. And we've been trying to get the transcripts from it, and they sealed them. The federal courts have sealed the transcripts. So I mean, you only seal when you want to conceal. That's, that's the way I feel about it. I mean, if it was above board and everything was legit, then I would think that you know, it would be simple. So far, you know, they're withholding that from us, you know, it's just, Ed is just, you know, another person who has jumped on the bandwagon to get a deal.

You know, I don't really want to go into real in depth and deep on this this next subject but Ed has, he's basically came clean, you know, and admitted that he lied, and why, and what he got in return for it, you know. It's just another example of a witness who was testifying in return for, in my opinion- I look at it like when you're given one of these guys that are in jail, a time cut, you're taking time off of their sentences, it's just like you're handing them a big bag of money. You might as well just be handing them a bag of gold because it's, it's the same thing. You're paying for testimony. And this is the type of evidence, these are the witnesses that the state says trumps everything else that any forensic testing could do.

I mean, we could do the forensic testing in this case, and get a hit to one of the other earlier named suspects who have a history of committing you know, armed robberies and shooting people. And according to the, you know, the McClean County State's

Attorney's Office, for all these years wouldn't matter, because of people like you know, Ed Hammond and Ed Palumbo, and, and, you know, Bill Moffat and Randy Howard and some of these other people. This is what's stopping me from getting forensic testing done, these people. I have to say, you know that, you know, just like, Ed Palumbo. Am I mad? Am I angry at Randy? At Randy Howard too? You know, I mean, he tried to do, you know, he tried to do the right thing, you know, he tried to tell the truth, but, you know, am I mad at these guys? Yes, I'm mad at them, you know. But do I forgive Ed Hammond? I do. You know, Ed Palumbo? I do. You know, I have two choices, you know, I can either, I can hang on to the anger and, and just let it you know, eat my day up. Or, you know, I can forgive these guys and just, you know, keep it moving.

And that's, that's pretty much what it is. I mean, Ed is just another example of, you know, the state withholding evidence, allowing a witness to testify to facts that they knew were false. And my attorney is just completely and totally dropping the ball. I mean, prior to trial they had, they had subpoena power, they could have subpoenaed for all, they could have subpoenaed for all of the IDOC records. They could have got the B of I records, they, you know, they could have got the (unintelligible) records. Everywhere you go in here, when you leave the cell house that you're in, they sign you out. What time you left and where you're going. You know, when you get where you're going they sign you in, and what time you got there. And it's the reverse when you go back to your cell house. They track your every move.

So, you know, we could have gotten those records pretrial. And tracked, you know, Ed Hammond was only in the same institution with me for six weeks. We could have tracked his movements for six weeks and absolutely proven, without a doubt, that we never were at the B of I together, you know? And I say it now and I'm always going to say, you know, if we never at the Bureau of Identification together for me to say, Hey, you know, come meet me at the yard so I can confess this crime to you. if we never met at the B of I, it didn't happen. That's, that's pretty much it on that, you know, and, you know, I just want to close with saying, you know, I appreciate you guys, you know, sticking around and staying involved and engaged in this thing. I mean, you know, this is what, and these are who, got me a life sentence for something I didn't commit. So, you know, I appreciate it you guys and stay tuned, there's more to come.

Bruce Fischer: We first heard Hammond's name mentioned by Bill Moffat from Episode 10. Recall, Moffat stated it was actually Hammond, who told him there were

three people involved in the crime, and that Hammond knows the story better than he does. Ed "Eddie" Hammond was Moffat's celly in Illinois Correctional Center. And in Moffat's initial report in 1995, Moffat stated that Hammond had told him that Jamie committed the Little homicide. That Troy Mayes was the driver, and that Ed Palumbo was with them.

Detectives Crowe, and Barkas visited Hammond in 1996. At this time, Hammond told police that he was a childhood friend of Jamie's and that everyone knows Jamie did the crime, but police can't prove it. At that time, he stated that Troy Mayes did not tell him he was the getaway driver and stated that while together in Illinois River prison, "Stretch" Mark McCowan, told him that he knew where the gun was, and that he was sure that Denny Hendricks would know about it.

In March of 1999, Bloomington detectives approached him and again, but this time his story more closely resembled Moffat's. This time, Hammond states that he knows for a fact that Jamie committed this crime, and that Stretch, Mayes, Hendricks and Donny Westerfield all also know for a fact that Jamie did it. Hammond goes on to say that in March of '95, Mayes told Hammond that he drove the car. Hammond and Mayes had previously robbed a bank together, and Mayes was the getaway driver in that crime, but was never charged.

(From recording)

Ed Hammond: Troy was telling me how I could trust him, 'cause he had not actually seen the newspaper article, stuff like that. I think they're gonna get (unintelligible) photos.

Detective: Thinking that they're gonna get you?

Ed Hammond: Right. And didn't have to worry about him because he never told on Jamie and he could have easily made a deal on Jamie and not got no time himself. So, you know, I knew he was (unintelligible) down, whatever.

Detective: But in the, in the in the bank robbery that you did, and I believe it was BankOne?

Ed Hammond: First of America Bank.

Detective: First of America Bank. The old Champion Federal.

Ed Hammond: Right. On Market.

Detective: Who drove the car?

Ed Hammond: Drove the car? Troy Mayes drove the car.

Detective: Okay, so he's telling you he could trust and he's not gonna tell on you?

Ed Hammond: Right.

Detective: So, you're in a motel and he's telling you this and he right out tells you what, about Jamie Snow?

Ed Hammond: He was one that drove the car and took him to the Clark station, just to do a robbery. He didn't go there to kill a guy. They went in and robbed the place. And that they parked in front of Brian Whitmer's house, which is around the corner from the Clark's station.

Detective: Now, is that on Linden Street, do you know, or East Holme or?

Ed Hammond: Believe it was Linden. You got, what is, yeah Empire and Linden.

Detective: Okay.

Ed Hammond: Yeah. So it'd be on Linden Street.

Detective: Okay.

Ed Hammond: He heard the gunshot, gunshots, not positive on that. Jamie come flying in there, told him go, get the hell out of here, go. And he asked what happened, he didn't tell him what happened till I actually the ride to Stretch's house, Mark McCowan's. I believe he's living with the girl at the time, I'm not positive. And that's when he told him he shot him. In fact he said he killed him. He knew he was dead.

Detective: Now did Troy say anything else about if he knew who the kid was or anything like that?

Ed Hammond: No.

Detective: Did he say anything about what kind of gun was used?

Ed Hammond: No. I got in my head that it's a .22 but I can't say that for sure. It's been too long. But it was a pistol.

Detective: So, basically the, the scope of your conversation with Troy is just, he drove with you, he drove, he drove, um, Jamie Snow.

Ed Hammond: Right.

Detective: And it was supposed to be a robbery. He parked the car by Brian Whitmer's house.

Ed Hammond: Right. Right in front of it.

(End recording)

Bruce Fischer: Detectives Katz and Barkas also visited Mayes, July 22, '99 and Mayes had his own story to tell. In that interview, and in his grand jury testimony, Mayes states, he didn't meet Jamie until around 1993. If true, that proves that he couldn't have been a getaway driver for the Clark robbery and homicide, as Hammond claims. The crux of Hammond's testimony is that Jamie confessed to him while they were together in Centralia prison, and had run into each other at the Bureau of Identification, even though they were in different housing units, Hammond testified that he snuck over into the yard where Jamie was, multiple times, and discussed the Little homicide. Hammond testified that he never got anything in exchange for testifying. In recent years, we've discovered communications between a federal attorney and Tina Griffin, the assistant state's attorney that alluded to a deal. Armed with this information, supporter Ray Wilson reached out to Hammond, and he and Jamie's attorney, Tara Thompson, visited him. Hammond gave a stunning affidavit in which he recanted his entire testimony.

Bruce Fischer: Hi, Ray, welcome to the Snow Files podcast. Can you tell us a little bit about yourself and how you got involved with the Jamie Snow case?

Ray Wilson: My name is Ray Wilson. I am a retired police chief, having worked in New Jersey Municipal Police Department for 37 years. I came to get involved in the case because, through my wife, my wife knew Jamie as she was his juvenile advocate when he was a teenager in Illinois. She came to find out that he was, had been arrested and was serving time and she made contact with him and struck up a conversation and correspondence and as she talked to him, she would start asking me questions about his case. And as she did, I kept saying it doesn't quite sound right, what the police are doing and gave her some information, you know, ask some questions and stuff like that and it just kept getting worse. It didn't take long, I'm pretty much came to the conclusion that Jamie had been railroaded. And that's where I got started. I've since filed a lot of FOIA requests, probably 70, 75, 80 FOIA requests, different departments, agencies. Look in his case. I've been doing it for probably six, seven years now, I think.

Bruce Fischer: You've certainly, certainly been dedicated to Jamie's case over the last, like you said, five or six years. In this episode, of course, we were discussing Ed Hammond and you've done extensive work on him. You've had some contact with Hammond. Can you tell us about your experiences with him?

Ray Wilson: Ed Hammond followed, kind of followed the mold of all the other snitches in this case. Eddie Hammond was a lifelong criminal. He had a extensive record for theft, armed robbery. Started, I want to say in like 1983, something like that. He was arrested multiple times down in Florida, multiple times in Illinois. And as I read the reports going through, you know, trying to figure out how the Bloomington Police Department put together the case, you could kind of follow it through the reports. You know, they talked to one guy, he leads him to another, you know, they talk to William Moffat, Moffat throws out Eddie Hammond's name, Hammond throws out other people's names and that's how, that's how the police worked in this to kind of start coming, coming up with these, these different witnesses.

But Eddie Hammond, as you start going through it, now, what we found for Ed Hammond, he was, he was arrested and his report was that he was with with Moffat, Moffat told him stories. He was with Jamie and he, what we came to find out in the end, he, although he was in Centralia prison with Jamie, that's where he, that's

where he told his story about Jamie. Hammond has been in prison a long time. He knows a lot of people. And that's how he came into the case. When I read his reports and stuff, to be perfectly honest, I thought Ed Hammond was the person who did the crime. I guess he gathered from all the different sources, and the police department and stuff like that. But Ed Hammond was actually one of the, had the most accurate description of what went down at the Clark station. He had the right caliber of gun in his story. Nobody else in all the other police reports ever said there's was, it was a .22. Ed Hammond had that. Ed Hammond had a rough guess at the amount of money that was taken. And, like I said, he was in Illinois at the time. And I actually suspected him as being responsible.

Ed Hammond was serving time when they were talking to him, when he was supposedly with Jamie. He was talking- He was serving time right then for an armed robbery of a Kroger grocery store. Now, the grocery store in the robbery, when Hammond was arrested, Ed Hammond actually had a gun on his possession that matched the type of gun that was used in, on Billy Little. Back stepping a little bit you know, the gun, the gun that was the murder weapon was actually kind of, kind of an odd weapon. It was called a Röhm. And Eddie Hammond had a .22 Röhm in his possession. One of the things that I've always looked at in a case, not so much to figure out who did it, but to see where the police department and stuff went wrong. And Eddie Hammond's case is another one where the police department, I think, screwed up a little bit. I think this is also a big miss on Jamie's attorney's part, that they never found this, but Eddie Hammond's gun was in Bloomington Police Department evidence locker in 1995, when Jamie's case is still an active homicide investigation. And the Bloomington police never, never tested this gun.

I know it, after the fact, after talking to him, and I know where he got it, I know where he stole it from, and I don't, I don't think it was the gun, but it was a big miss on the police department's part. They had a comparable weapon in their evidence locker and never tested it. Through different FOIA requests, I found that this gun has since been destroyed, surprisingly on the same destruction order as another Röhm .22 that was taken off of somebody else, a juvenile. But this is, these are the big misses that kind of lock me into mistakes on the Bloomington police departments part, and what they did wrong, and how they kind of came to using these these witnesses, these jailhouse informants, that was, that was their only case.

So with, with Ed Hammond, and one of the FOIAs, now, the date again, Hammond was serving for a robbery of the Kroger grocery store. A couple months before he

pulled the grocery store robbery, he robbed a bank in Bloomington, and this is one of the things that came through a FOIA. In none of the Bloomington police reports that we ever received, was ever a mention of this bank robbery. Other stuff I found in Hammond's arrest report are questions where he was into federal custody, and at one point he was listed as absconded from the federal system. And I could never put it together. I finally, in one FOIA, came some correspondence, really it's two letters, one from Ed Hammond's attorney to Tina Griffin and Charles Reynard saying, I represented Ed Hammond in a federal case, and you basically promised that you would support a downward departure on some federal sentencing. And the second piece of correspondence right there was, Tina Griffin writing a letter to the US Attorney saying, he gave information, he testified, and Jamie was convicted.

And truth is, this is where Hammond got, he got a downward departure on his federal sentence. He was supposed to serve, he was serving time in state prison for the Kroger's, and he was supposed to go into 10 years of federal penitentiary after he was done with the state. And basically, like he testified to in the trial, he was done with his state sentence. He was near the end of his, what he testified to, he got no, no state deal. And this is some of the stuff that he, he later has recanted, that he got his directions, that he wasn't to talk about the federal case. He was being truthful actually, when he says he got no state deal. When he said he was done with his term, he's near the end of his term, he was, he was actually right with that. He said from all those papers, I contacted Ed to ask him about it, about the deal. I told him I wasn't looking for him to recant information on his testimony, I just wanted to talk about about the deal. And I asked him, one of the things I had researched a little bit was was the federal deal, and some of the case, the docket information on the federal deal was all sealed, and you can't access that.

So I asked Ed Hammond if he would, if I could contact his attorney, and his attorney that represented him, could give me any information. He agreed to that. He also told me then that he wouldn't be, he wouldn't say anything that would implicate himself in anything he testified to, or anything like that. But I could, I could ask the attorney and I, and I did. His attorney has since retired and closed his practice and following he had all his records shredded. And so that was a dead end. I went back to Ed, wrote him, I told him I was actually, told him I was coming down to Florida on vacation and asked if he would talk to me and he, and he agreed to that. So I visited him down in prison in Florida. He's down there serving like 15 years for another armed robbery and as a habitual felon, and he talked to me. He explained everything

about how the deal worked. He explained how the Bloomington police, Katz and Barkas came to visit him in Dixon. And he went on from there.

From talking to him I found out there's a lot of, a lot more information that the Bloomington police have kept from us. There's one report where, I think Tammy and Lesley will talk about here in a minute. About the, when they visited him in 1999 in Dixon. He gave a statement. He talked about when they visited him back after in 1995 or '96. He told me why he lied in that statement and a couple other things. But what he also told me was that he first refused to talk to them and they went away. They came back and visited him a second time. And that's where there's, there's only one report from 1999 that we get. So he was actually, they were actually there a couple times. And after the police department, Katz and Barkes left, several days after that is when Reynard and Griffin came to visit him in Dixon. And that's where all the deal was kind of struck.

So he agreed to give a deposition about the information that he and I talked about. We told, I told Jamie's attorney Tara. Tara and I went back down to Florida and took a, took a, an affidavit from Hammond in the prison, the summer of last year, in which he started talking and through this, he went on and, not only told us the story about the State Attorney's Office and the police department visited him, and his statement and stuff like that, and how he was being instructed. But he went on to actually recant his whole testimony, saying he had, he had thoughts, he had been thinking about it, and he wanted to make things right. That's basically where we stand now with Hammond and Hammond is down in Florida, still locked up, He's not due to get out until like 2025. But that's, that's my story with Ed Hammond.

Bruce Fischer: Now as we move forward here talking about Hammond, and with all the things we're going to discuss, he has completely recanted everything we're discussing today?

Ray Wilson: He has recanted everything. He said some of the some of the statements that he made about meeting Jamie in the yard was all fabricated. He was guided through that. You'll hear some of the stuff where Jamie's attorney, Picl, had brought in a, somebody from the prison who would testify they can't go from one yard to the other and stuff like that. Hammond, Hammond acknowledged seeing Jamie in Centralia. When he recanted, he said he saw Jamie in the medical office and he saw Jamie for a total of about five minutes. Nothing more than kind of acknowledge him from across the room and that was it. From what I've learned, I

guess they were in separate, separate units, East and West, or East and South, they would have been in different assignments and none of it was, none of it was factual.

Bruce Fischer: Okay. One quick question about Hammond's gun. It's interesting what you mentioned about, I know it's irrelevant now because we now know that that gun was not used in the Clark station robbery, but I just, I'm curious to know how Hammond would have known what type of weapon was used in that armed robbery.

Ray Wilson: My, my, I don't know. That's what made me consider him for the longest time as person responsible. Like I told Hammond when I talked to him, I told him, I said, I thought you did it. I was convinced. I would have bet a pension check on him that he did it.

Bruce Fischer: And that's what led you to do such extensive work on him particularly.

Ray Wilson: Well that's what I kept digging and digging and digging. I saw where he was, he was actually sentenced for some other charge. Why I knew he was in Illinois at the time, and was, and could have been doing it, was he was sentenced like on May 2nd, May 4th, or something like that for a different, different theft or something. I FOIA'd the county sheriff and asked for their inmate records, where it shows when they go from, taken from their cell, taken to court and taken from you know, different, different movements they keep track of. And I actually dug so deep that I found where Eddie Hammond was in McLean County jail on March 31, 1991. So basically where I suspected him, I went all the way through, and although I thought there's a very big circumstantial case against him, he had a gun. He did robberies. He never he, I mean, he brought his first crime was a grocery store in Florida, throughout them in Illinois. The robbery he's in Florida right now, it was another grocery store. I don't know what the attraction was, but he was actually in McLean County jail on March 31st. And that's how I know he was not responsible for the murder.

I asked him where, where the gun that he had, where it came from, and he said, Well, he stole it from a place he worked in Florida. He took it out of the boss's drawer and kept it. But again, it kind of goes more to, not so much post conviction appeal right now, but if he, when Jamie gets back into court, they can go on the stand and say, Bloomington police, you had, you had weapons in your storage that you never,

you never tested. Well, I mean, basically it makes the police look bad. It looks like they don't do their job and it questions everything else, it puts, it puts a cloud over everything else they've done to convict him.

Bruce Fischer: You did the work. You tracked down the gun, you now know where it came from. They didn't bother to even look into it at all.

Ray Wilson: Uh no. They had it. Like I said, they had, they had two Röhm. It's a German gun. Two Röhm .22 caliber pistols in their evidence locker in 1994, 1995, 1996. I got the records when they were destroyed. Interesting is, person that destroyed, that authorized the destruction of the weapons, there's a whole series of guns that were destroyed at the time. Tina Griffin signed off on it.

Bruce Fischer: Well, let's get into some more of the details about Hammond. Have you talked to Stretch? What do you know about how he feels about Hammond saying that Jamie, he and another guy planned the robbery for drug money, and that Stretch got rid of the gun?

Ray Wilson: I've never talked to Mark or Stretch. I mean, I, names, names kept coming out. I think people just threw the names out. And when we talked to Hammond in the end, like I said, Hammond, Hammond was arrested and in county jail in 1991 when this went down. He, in his, in his statement says that this, this was the talk in prison when this happened. And names start going around. You'll hear in other reports, Hammond. Hammond throws out Palumbo's name, he throws out Troy Mayes' name. They're all, I don't want to say it's in one big group. They, they're aware of each other, they know, they know each other, they may not be close friends. They may not hang out together. But, like I said, it's not that big of a town. There, they have some knowledge of different people. And like I said, you see the same names keep coming up throughout the investigation. One leads to the next, they, they just talk.

Bruce Fischer: Right? Now, as you just mentioned, Hammond introduced Ed Palumbo into his taped interview. He said that Jamie told Palumbo to shut up about the crime. And he was sure he knew what happened. What was the deal with that?

Ray Wilson: All the players are the same. I mean, there's a, there's a lot of stuff going down in Bloomington at the time. The Clark station, there is a previous Clark station here. There's the bus station. A lot of people were involved with one or the other of

them. Ed got picked up and Palumbo's name was, was in this mix from the beginning. They talk, they talk, they, they meet in prison or they meet in holding when they're brought back, back to court. There's discussion. And you know, did you hear this? Did you hear that? In Ed's, when he recants, he actually says, I never, everything I said was, was fabricated. Everything I said was a lie. I had rumors. I, that's all they were, was all rumors. And he picked up on different times they talked. Palumbo, Palumbo's name gets thrown in. Well, Palumbo did it. Troy Mayes' name gets thrown in it. There's bad blood between Mayes and Eddie Hammond over the bank robbery. That's why Ed Hammond gave some of his statements. I said all the names keep coming back, it's a, it's kind of a vicious circle of people.

Bruce Fischer: It certainly is. One of the things that I've always been intrigued by is the fact that, all of these different people can, none of their stories line up perfectly, but just as long as they somehow mention at some point or another that Jamie was involved, that's all the police need.

Ray Wilson: I think you're, actually hit the nail on the head there.

Bruce Fischer: Well, you've certainly done incredible work on this case. And I know everybody involved appreciates it greatly.

Ray Wilson: No problem. I just keep digging. There's, there's other people that kind of the same boat that would like to, to discredit to the same degree.

Bruce Fischer: And there's far too many cases. That's for sure. Tam, Ed Hammond said that Denny Hendricks definitely knew Jamie did it, and he has partied with them, and they beat people up together. When you talked to Denny from the last episode, did he mentioned anything about Ed Hammond?

Tammy Alexander: Well, the only thing that he mentioned about Eddie, and he referred to him as Eddie, was that he grew up with him. He really didn't have anything else to say about him. You know, he definitely knew him and said that he grew up with him. But you know, as Ray mentioned, when he threw out Denny's name he threw out Donnie Wester-I think it's Donnie Westerfield's name. But he just threw out, you know, different names just randomly it seemed.

Bruce Fischer: Didn't Bill Moffat say in the last episode that Hammond told him he was the getaway driver? Now Hammond is saying some other guy he did a robbery

with said he was the getaway driver. What do you think is going on with this?

Tammy Alexander: I think since they were cellies and both from Bloomington, that they were probably discussing the crime, as mentioned before, and that's why there are similarities in their stories. Recall, Moffat did say Eddie knows the story better than he does, and that Eddie told him the story. Now Eddie is mad at Troy Mayes because he literally got away with being the getaway driver in the bank robbery. He was very upset about that. And he knew that he drove for him, so it really wasn't a stretch for him to say that he drove, that Mayes drove for Jamie. And he was mad at him anyway, so he didn't have any problem. I guess he felt like he took the fall, total fall for the, for the bank robbery.

Bruce Fischer: Hammond mentioned in his taped interview that he thought his robbery accomplice was going to flip on them for a \$1,000 Crimestoppers reward because he was a cocaine addict, just like him. So he knew how he needed that money. That is interesting. Do you know if Hammond was ever interested in the Bill Little reward money?

Tammy Alexander: Oh, we don't know if he was interested in the reward money or if he received any reward money. We've already talked about the federal deal, that was huge. But it is interesting that he mentioned it, and also the great disparity between his figure and Moffat's figure. He said there was a \$1,000, Moffat said there was \$25,000, so it was a big rumor mill thing. The part that's interesting to me is that he knew people were snitching. You know, he's alluding to the fact that people were snitching for reward money.

Ray Wilson: One thing with Hammond is, that struck me before, was that Hammond never came up in the initial investigation. Hammond was never looked at, as, as a suspect. Never talked to until after Moffat's interview back in 1995 or '94, '95, '96, whenever that was. So, about the reward, when the reward was being given out, or they talked about in '91, he never came out at that time to say anything about it. I don't know if he would, if he knew about it, like I said, they thought he said they talked about it, they were talking in the jail about it, so I'm sure he did, but he never came out and said, he never tried throwin' his two cents in at the beginning.

Tammy Alexander: Hey Ray, do you think that the cops, the reason that he wasn't a suspect was the cops probably, probably determined that he was in jail that night too?

Ray Wilson: I'm, I'm sure they well, I would hope they did. You know, I keep looking at the Bloomington police of what they did and didn't do the whole time. And I mean, just any witness that they had, they never, they never checked witnesses' alibis, they never, you know, the police should go and anybody that's, anybody that's their witness, they should be investigated to the same degree to clear the witness as they do to convict the actor, and they don't do that. They never, they never, they never checked anybody else's alibis, they never checked anybody else's story. So I would, I would hope if Hammond is, was on some kind of a master list of suspected armed robbers in Bloomington that they actually did, I would never guarantee they didn't.

Bruce Fischer: Lesley, let's discuss Ed Hammond's trial testimony. What did Hammond testify to at trial?

Lesley Pires: Hammond pretty much told the same story at trial that he did in the 1999 recorded interview, and he came off as believable because he kept saying that he knew Jamie for 25 years, and that they were childhood friends, just like the other snitches said. And he kept dropping the names of all the people who liked Jamie, that Ray mentioned. Ed Palumbo. Denny Hendricks. And you might recognize them from the previous episodes. And he also said that he knew Bill Moffat, the rapist from the last episode. And I can sense that he had some distaste for Bill. He actually testified at Susan's trial that he thought Bill Moffat was incredible, but it was based on his opinion only so it caused his entire testimony to get stricken. So this testimony at Jamie's trial is the first that we have on record from him.

Some of the things the prosecution harped on to align with what the other witnesses said, was that Jamie supposedly told him there was a car pulling into the parking lot. And since they hadn't identified him yet, he was sure they wouldn't, and also that Jamie used a pistol. Both of those things were said by Bill Moffat at trial, and Moffat was Hammond's cellmate at one time, so it's no wonder they have the same misinformation to tell. He also kept using Denny Hendrick's name as a way to bolster his story during his interview, but he didn't mention him at the trial. And that's also reminiscent of Bill Moffat's false testimony where he said Hendricks would vouch for him and say they were both at parties together with Jamie.

Ed Hammond had also information on two people who were important to impeach at Jamie's trial, and that's Troy Mayes, who he claimed admitted to being the getaway driver, and Bill Moffat. The prosecution successfully barred Jamie's defense from

introducing either of these people. They said that Frank Picl kept trying to introduce alternative suspects without laying a proper foundation. And bringing Mayes into the discussion based off his affinity for bragging about crimes wasn't sufficient reason enough to break that rule. So they got that in before questioning even started, and Reynard went out of his way to remind the judge that Frank couldn't go down that road.

And then later, because of what Skelton did during Susan's trial with Hammond, in regards to his thoughts on Moffat, that line of questioning was off limits at Jamie's trial right away. If you remember in the last episode, I explained how Skelton tried to get the judge to strike Moffat's entire testimony because he had little relation to Jamie, and what he was saying was all hearsay. And that was a bold move and it didn't work. But I suspect he did something similar to get Hammond's testimony completely stricken, and that worked. So this time they didn't let it fly for Jamie. And as soon as Picl brought up Moffat's name to Hammond, probably to start modeling what Skelton did and pulled off, the prosecution objected and the judge blocked it. So the prosecution really did their prep work in Susan's trial to ensure Jamie's trial went their way.

Bruce Fischer: So how did Jamie's attorney Frank Picl, take on Hammond then?

Lesley Pires: Well, he started with general questions and then pulled off his classic move, asking Hammond if he thought he was an honest and truthful person. Hammond said that he was, even though he has a bad past and a bad record. And I didn't really like when Picl did this in the past. It kind of worked with Bill Moffat in the last episode, where he got him to admit he was a terrible person to the jury, but this time I appreciated it. He let Hammond explain to the jury why he thinks so highly of himself given his situation and he didn't badger him. And it was good. It must have been like watching someone say the sky is green and the grass is blue. And I think it worked here.

Similar to Moffat, he also got Hammond to admit that he had ample writing supplies and phone calls, and that he did not make any accusations against Jamie. In fact told no one, just like Moffat, until approached by BPD detectives a year after he had the information.

Picl also backed him into a corner and aggravated him on the stand. He got him to admit that although he claims to have known Jamie for 25 years, he doesn't know

the names of anyone in his family, where he went to school, or where he ever lived. Hammond gets so mad that he blurts out, 'If you want to go there, what about, well, I was probably in fifth grade and he broke into my house?' So, I thought that was amusing because during his interview, he told detectives that Jamie had stolen his brother's Atari tapes. But now at the trial, he's saying that Jamie did a home burglary when he was like, what? Eleven? So that's a lie. They were never childhood friends, never family acquaintances, even as kids. So it amuses me that Hammond was so prideful, he took his lie so seriously, he actually got insulted and doubled down even harder.

The other thing that Picl did that came in handy was get Hammond to say that he and Jamie were housed in different buildings, but used the same yard, which is against the rules. This is very important because it's impossible. And Picl called the prison worker to stand to verify that this could have not happened. He actually supervised Jamie on his work unit at the same time, so he knew him very well, and he never knew of any complaint that Jamie or Hammond use the other yards. So therefore they couldn't even have met up in the yard.

Picl also asked Hammond about if he told his would be father in law, (had he married the woman he fathered a child with), that he never even knew Jamie when he ran into him at the courthouse while testifying against Susan. And that was great, because that man was brought in as a witness as well. And he told Jamie's jury that Hammond said that to him. Picl asked him, like three questions, and it was quick and direct, and it really should have impeached Hammond.

So Jamie's federal habeas petition from 2016 highlighted this testimony pretty well. It stated that of all the confession witnesses, Hammond was the only one they didn't have new evidence against. But they didn't need it, because his trial testimony was so weak and he was impeached by the prison worker, and his child's grandfather. And I agree that Hammond was impeached by Jamie's defense, but like Jamie said, they could have done more and gotten the movement records from the prison to administratively prove that the story was impossible. They did get two witnesses to show up and directly impeach him though, and it makes me wonder what the outcome would have been if Frank Picl impeached the other seven witnesses with the same vigor.

Tammy Alexander: I have a question about that. It's interesting to me, that Picl didn't jump on him saying that he stole some Atari tapes for him. As if that could be

some type of, you know, his testimony could be some type of retaliation. And that he been burgled from Jamie before.

Lesley Pires: Well, what happened was he was pestering him like, Oh, you don't know the family, anybody in his family's name? You don't know where he lived, you don't know this, you don't know that, you don't know that. And then he asked him a random question, and then really pissed him off because he goes back and he's like, oh, so you haven't known anything about him for 20 years, have you? And then that's when he threw that in. So Picl didn't even respond, he just, he just cut him off and said, So are you saying you have, you don't know anything about him for 20 years? I don't think he wanted it to get in there, that Hammond thought Jamie was a thief, but it was almost like Hammond didn't even say it. You know, it didn't get any play at all.

Tammy Alexander: So that's just interesting to me. I don't know if that would have been good strategy or not. I don't know, but certainly would show that he had no love loss for Jamie.

Lesley Pires: Well, yeah. And also, that's laying the foundation. What Tina Griffin keeps accusing Picl of doing is, you know, she says that he likes to just grab a piece of paper from a prior trial and start reading off of it and say, Did you say this? Did you say that? And that that's a strategy, and that it's against the rules, because he doesn't lay a proper foundation to start reading off that paper. Well, here you have this guy introduce it himself, so that is proper foundation, and Picl could have taken out that recorded interview and been like, but wait a minute, didn't you say it was Atari tapes in 1999? And now, two years later, you're saying it was a burglary? Which one is it? You know, so you're right. He could have impeached him and argued with him, you know, about that and exaggerating.

Tammy Alexander: Right.

Bruce Fischer: Right. Jamie mentioned that Hammond has since recanted, and we discussed it briefly as well. This is new evidence since Jamie's 2016 federal habeas was filed. Can you share with us what is going on with that?

Ray Wilson: He's recanted and recanted, you know, directly to Jamie's attorney. So that, plus the information that we've found in the FOIA about the, about the deal, it kind of goes into Tara's ballpark now. How she handles it, I don't know exactly where

they stand with, kind of, when to, when to pull the trigger and go with the next appeal. That's Jamie's, Jamie's move and Tara's move. One thing that Jamie and I've always talked about is, and I understand his situation, we come up with new information. This information with Hammond, we didn't develop it until the middle of '19, or the fall of 2019. So, Jamie's, Jamie's position is, we keep finding new information, and it's kind of when to, when to dump it into the court and make a move. So, again, it's Tara and Jamie's, Jamie's ballpark.

Bruce Fischer: A lot of that comes with these major delays we're always seeing what these filings. They take years to go through. And of course, the case is still being investigated by you and Tara, and everybody who's trying to gain more information.

Ray Wilson: And we keep coming up with more information. I mean, there's, there's the other papers, there's, there's the DNA, it's still up in the air.

Bruce Fischer: I mean, this federal habeas was filed four years ago, which is considered recent when you're dealing with cases like this, but we're still talking about four years.

Ray Wilson: Exactly.

Bruce Fischer: It makes it very difficult.

Lesley Pires: Now we know that all eight of those confessional witnesses have had new evidence and they've all been dismissed, basically. So Tam, I know you talk about all the time, about knocking them all down one by one. So who's next on your list that we really need to knock down?

Tammy Alexander: Well, I think we're probably going to cover Bruce Roland's next. But we'll see how he's been knocked down. I'm not, I'm not sure. But um, I mean, I'd have to you know, I'd have to look at the list of, list of people. There are a couple of people I don't, you know, some people you just don't know why they testified. Like, uh, you know, Danny Martinez, we we know he lied. But you know, trying to figure out why is just like banging your head against the wall.

Lesley Pires: Yeah, we did two episodes on him and we have no contact with him. Nobody's spoken to him or interviewed him since the trial and gotten any decent

information out of it. I guess he would be, you know, the most valuable. We'd love to have an affidavit like these guys from him, right?

Tammy Alexander: Yeah.

Ray Wilson: One other person that same boat as all the others, that we haven't talked to, or gotten a real clear picture on is Kevin Shawl, and um he's actually in Mississippi prison right now, that I'm working on trying to make some contact with. Kevin Shawl's another guy that got a federal, a federal deal. Bloomington, or state attorney in McLean County, seemed to have a good connection with the, or good luck with federal prosecutors and talking to them and making deals.

Tammy Alexander: And we invite anybody to come forward if, you know, if they want to correct, make any corrections, or state their side, or anything. We invite everybody to come on, and we will give you a forum to speak and you know, refute any allegations that you think are incorrect.

Lesley Pires: And don't forget about that \$10,000 reward if any of that information is useful to getting Jamie back in court.

Tammy Alexander: That's right.

Bruce Fischer: We invite any witness featured on the Snow Files podcast, to come on the show, give their point of view, or to clarify anything that they think might have been misstated.

Lesley Pires: In this episode, we discovered that Ed Hammond never even knew Jamie, but he told his jury they had a 25-year history, and that Jamie even broke prison rules to spend time with him, crossing into his yard several times to confess. His story was impossible, but the state facilitated a generous federal plea deal to ensure his cooperation. After nearly 20 years, Hammond said he made it all up. But now he just wants to do the right thing.

If you have any information that may help Jamie, please call the tip line at 888-710-SNOW. There is a \$10,000 reward for any information leading to a new trial or the exoneration of Jamie Snow. The tip line is free and confidential. Unfortunately, Ed Hammond and Bill Moffat weren't the only inmates testing the waters to see what they could get. Bruce Roland also checked the temperature. He sent a letter to the

state, saying he heard about the reward money, thought his sentence was too harsh, and he wanted to talk. He got an amended sentence after testifying against Jamie. How did Bruce Roland get away with this? That's next time on Snow Files.

Transcribed by: Jinger Fiola

© 2020 Snow Files. All Rights Reserved.