

# Episode 9



**Season 1 : E9 - Show Me the Money: Randy Howard**

**May 7, 2020**

**Speakers: Bruce Fischer, Jamie Snow, Tammy Alexander, Lesley Pires**

---

**Episode Description:** In 1999, while the grand jury was hearing testimony for Jamie Snow's indictment, a cold case detective with a vendetta started his day bright and early. He had important business to take care of with his paid informant. Detective Rick Barkes woke up Randy Howard at 5:30am to check and see if Jamie told him a joke or a murder confession 8 years prior. Randy had received \$500 from a lead homicide detective around the same time he supposedly heard this joke. He said he agreed to whatever this detective asked him just to make him leave. Randy Howard played the system for the next two years, telling Jamie's jury, "If I would have known we would have ended up here today, I would have said things a lot differently [...] I never, never expected to be here." This ninth episode of Snow Files presents the value in a dollar for an informant who thinks they'll never make it to trial.

---

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

---

**Bruce Fischer:** The mission of the Snow Files Podcast is to expose the misconduct of 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:** I think this week we should talk about somebody that wasn't uh specifically a jailhouse informant but someone who was actually just as compromised as uh any of the informants were and that's a guy named Randy Howard. Randy was a, was a kid who lived in the same neighborhood that I did. He was, I'm, I'm gonna guess he was maybe five years younger than me. So, when he lived in the neighborhood with me, he was maybe between eight and 10 years old, and I was 14 or 15 years old. He was staying with his grandmother uh, I think. And there came a point in time when she couldn't care for him anymore, and DCFS came in and, and, and took him out, and I didn't see him anymore. He was gone. He went to a foster home. And umm, you know, kind of like the, the Steve Shield story. I hadn't seen him, you know, since he was maybe 9 or 10 years old. And uh he just, you know, he popped up, you know and, and uh, and years later, in 1991, I didn't even recognize him, he had grown up, he put on some weight.

Turns out, I found out later on, Randy was actually a paid informant for the Bloomington Police Department. He was a, he was, a Crime Stopper. He was he was calling into Crime Stoppers and uh reporting on, you know, whatever he had information on and was getting paid for it. That, that actually came out in trial, he actually admitted that Charlie Crowe had paid him, I think, six, six or nine hundred dollars. So, and, and Randy had actually when I was arrested at my sister's house in April of uh 1991 for the unrelated case, Randy was actually the one who had provided the information to the Bloomington Police Department that had got us arrested.

So, you know, what's really interesting about Randy is that he was at the Bloomington Police Department on the 11th of April 1991, and he was in, you know, giving them information, and it was the information that had gotten me arrested at my sister's house. It was the information that he got paid for. Now, this would have been 10 days after, 11 days after uh Bill Little's murder. Now when he's at the police station, he doesn't say anything about this, the, the murder of Bill Little or anything, doesn't even mention it.

You fast forward to 1998 or, or 1997 and Rick Barkes, Dan Katz, who it seems as soon as Dan Katz took over the case for Charlie Crowe, everybody's memory got so much better. And the thing that he did I mean, Dan Katz was so corrupt. I, I can't even go into everything that he did, but I will at a later time as we move through this. But he shows up to Randy Howard's house eight, nine years later, and now all of a sudden Randy's got this big story to tell. And you know, a person who's lying, uh people that

make things up as they go along, they really don't, they really don't pay attention to the things that can actually be proven or disproven.

Randy, Randy told the detectives that it was either the, the, the night of the murder or, or the next day, within a day or two, he called me to come pick him up at the bus station. I went to pick him up at the bus station, and that I, I, I told him man, man, Bro, I, I, I messed up, I, I killed this kid at the gas station, and, and, and Randy said, he looked at me and had this strange look on his face, you know? And then I just started laughing and said, no, you know, I'm just kidding, man. I'm just joking.

The thing about it is guys is that, you know, in, in April, in January and February and March, April, May, I never had a phone. We, we never had a phone, and, and ,and, and this is one of the things I tried to get my attorneys before I went to trial. I'm like, look, we didn't have a phone. He could have never called me to come pick him up at the bus station. That never happened. And I, I tried to get him to contact you know uh, AT&T or whoever it was that had the phone companies back then you know that to show that no, you know, at the very beginning of his story, he was lying. You know, he, he could have never called me to come pick him up.

But here's the thing that's, that I think is even more damaging to Randy's credibility is that he was probably in '98-99, didn't realize, he probably didn't even remember that he was at the police station on the 11th of April 1991. He probably forgot all about that, because, you know, here's a guy that is motivated by Crime Stopper money. He's at the police station within, you know, 10, 7, 8, 9, 10 days of supposedly me confessing a murder to him, they're offering this big reward. And he doesn't say one word about it, nothing. Crickets. If it had really happened, he would have been telling them, it probably wouldn't have took him to the 11th of April to go down there and tell them had I of told him on the second or the third, so, you know, if, if you know what they did was, is they, you know, went and got their paid informant who they knew had a, a, a history of, of making statements against me for money and uh, and got what they wanted out of him.

Now, now Randy did later on give us an affidavit and state you know and, and, said look you know, I, I was just telling them what they wanted to hear so they would uh, so they would leave my house, you know, so they'd leave me alone. But you know, I don't believe that I don't think he was just telling them what they wanted to hear. I mean, I, I think that was part of it, but I think he was just telling them what they wanted to hear so he could get some of that, that Crime Stopper money. But, you

know, that's just another thing where, where my attorneys failed to use the, the, the discovery materials to impeach another witness.

I mean, you know, and, and I'm, I said it before, I'm gonna say it over and over, you know, this case was about witness credibility. There's no DNA, there's no confession. There's, there's nothing. It boils down to the credibility of witnesses. And I, I have to believe that had the jury of known what Randy's true motivations were uh, and what kind of person he really was, I, I, I think his credibility would have been shot. I mean, they, they just didn't get a chance to fully uh, you know, fully, fully address and, and consider his credibility. And I, and I think it was, you know, one part, you know, the state withholding the fact that he was a paid informant. And one part, you know, my attorneys not reading the discovery materials to uh to impeach him, I think that's a big deal.

I mean, I didn't have a phone, so that was a lie. You were at the police station within a few days of, you know, me allegedly confessing this, this, this murder to you and you don't say a word about it, nothing. You know, and you're (inaudible) your, your, your, your motivation for being there was to get money. So, you know, this is, you know, and, and, and again this, this is one of the witnesses. This is what the state's attorneys in McLean County have for all these years, stacked up against the, the efforts and the request to do the forensic testing. Randy Howard is stopping me from getting forensic testing done. (Inaudible) these are the people that are stopping me from getting forensic testing done and its just, it's a sham, ya know and uh, hopefully, you know there's some other information that I'm sure Tammy and Bruce and Lesley will, will expose for you guys. Some of the other crazy, wild, unbelievable, things that Randy was telling uh, was telling the, the police.

The main thing is, at the very beginning of his story I called him on the phone to come, to come and, and get me the bus station. Total Lie. Could have never happened. Didn't have a phone, and if he didn't call me to come pick him up at the bus station. I didn't go pick him up the bus station and I didn't confess I committed a murder to him. Not only did I not have a phone, we didn't have a car, we couldn't go and pick him up. That's where the impeachment of Randy Howard should have started from the very first thing that Frank Picl should have been arguing to the jury, the very first sentence, the first thing out of his mouth was a lie. Because here's the record from AT&T, he didn't have a phone. Here's the records from the DMV, they didn't own a car. That's where the impeachment begins. That's where you, when

your case rises and falls on credibility, the witness's credibility, that's where you start. That's where you have to begin, you know, and, and they just uh, they just let it go.

**Bruce Fischer:** Randy Howard called in a Crime Stoppers tip in early April 1991, about the string of robberies that were happening in the Bloomington area. Howard visited police on April 11, 1991. And when asked about Jamie's involvement in those crimes, Howard stated that he took for granted that Jamie was involved. Jamie had told him that someone else had probably done the bus station burglary and the burglary at Harper's gas station. In that April 11, 1991 encounter with police, Howard never said anything about the Clark Station murder. Howard said he received \$500 for his tips to police at that time. Eight years later, Detectives Katz and Barkes approached Howard about the Clark Station case at his home in Champaign, Illinois. It was at that time that Howard told police several new details.

Jamie's trademark was to tuck his hair up under his hat when he didn't want to be recognized. When Jamie was in prison in 1993 his wife had an affair and he suspected it was Bill Little. And if it was, there was a high probability that Jamie shot Bill over it. Within 24 hours after the Clark shooting, that Jamie picked him up at the bus station and told him man, Bro, I fucked up, but then laughed it off as if he was joking. That Jamie had several guns at the time, but he had never seen them. And that he had heard about a spot in his trailer where he had a stash. He went on to tell police about a snub-nose .38 that he had given to Jamie and that when Jamie returned it, there was one bullet missing, and then eventually he had sold the gun to his uncle. Jamie knew Bill Little because they went to high school together. Jamie told him he only got \$40 from the Clark murder. Jamie told him he drove to the crime scene. Jamie told him that he did the murder alone. He was very worried about the composites that were around town.

Howard would go on to testify in Jamie's trial. However they cherry picked which items they would use. It even seemed as though Howard became a hostile witness, trying to play both sides of the fence. The following are excerpts from Howard's grand jury testimony from September 1999:

*I'm sure I probably said something like, ah, you're stupid or something. And then shortly after he said ah, I was just joking. I didn't really do it.*

*Back then it seemed like such a meaningless conversation. I didn't pay that much attention. I didn't feel like it was an actual confession.*

*I honestly think he just wanted to get a rise out of me. And I think if he did honestly do it, I don't think he would have said a word. He definitely wouldn't have said something like that. I don't think.*

*Everybody's got a price on that. At that time Jamie's price wasn't very high. Some people would have turned him in immediately. If the shooting would have happened, and then he brings me this gun back, I think I would have handcuffed him and took him down to the jailhouse myself. We were always petty thieves, petty criminals, wannabes, all of us. Always agreed that murder was over the line unless it deserved it. We always agreed that murder was just too far.*

*Can I voice an opinion? I mean, I don't know if you guys want to know it or not. Like I said, Jamie was always a very petty thief. And I honestly don't think he killed that guy. I don't have any evidence to prove it, but I honestly don't think he did it. I'm sure Jamie deserves to be in jail for something. But I just don't think that's it.*

The following are excerpts from Howard's testimony in Jamie's trial from December 2001:

*If you've got it there in front of you, I probably said it.*

*I assume the whole conversation was meaningless.*

*I hadn't even thought about this in two years. So if I would have known he would have ended up here today, I would have said things a lot differently.*

*Now, I wouldn't remember most of it now. The only reason why I keep remembering it is because you keep telling me I said it.*

*I don't remember exactly what I said. But I'm sure you're going to tell me.*

*I would not call it a trademark. One time he showed up at my house in a baseball cap with it severely pulled down. I hadn't seen him in years. So it was a surprise visit. I answered the door. I didn't know who he was. Then he pulled the hat back, and it was Jamie, and we went on from there.*

*Didn't then don't now. For one Jamie had a beard. I've never seen him in an earring. He was also at the time the heaviest I've ever seen him in his life. He had to be close to 250 at that time, this is visibly a skinny man right there.*

*Question: Okay, on or about April 11, 91, do you remember receiving \$900 for giving Detective Crowee some information about some crimes here in Champaign?*

*Howard: No, that did not happen.*

*Question: Pardon me?*

*Howard: That did not happen. I received \$500 from Rusty Thomas.*

*Question: Do you know who shot Bill Little?*

*Howard: No, I do not. If I did they'd be in jail.*

*I believed he was trying to get a rise out of me. That's what I believe happened.*

**Bruce Fischer:** The most important point, though, is that nothing Howard testified to at trial was told to police the first time he talked to them on April 11, 1991. Even though he was at the police station informing on Jamie about criminal activity in exchange for cash. He was a paid informant. And even though Jamie had allegedly confessed to him within 24 hours of the crime, only 10 short days later, Howard said nothing to police about this alleged confession, even though it would have yielded much more than \$500.

Additionally, at that April 11, 1991 interview, nothing Howard testified to in 1999 was told to police. Nothing about guns, nothing about an affair between Bill Little and Jamie's wife, nothing about stating that he did the crime alone and only got \$40, nothing about Jamie picking Howard up at the bus station. Nothing. It was pulled out of thin air in 1999. The credibility of the state's witnesses was the linchpin in securing a conviction against Jamie. There was no confession or physical evidence in this case. This case rose and fell based on a determination of the credibility of the state's witnesses by Jamie's jury. Further, the state is refusing to test physical evidence based on witnesses such as Howard, a paid informant who had a history of making statements to police in return for cash.

**Bruce Fischer:** Tam, this seems like another case of a casual confession. Jamie said he was never in a car picking up Howard, and the entire conversation never happened. He said phone and DMV records could prove this. Have any of these records ever been gathered?

**Tammy Alexander:** Well, as far as we know, they didn't gather any of that information. I did manage to find the phone book page, where his or Tammy's name should have been listed in the phone listing and there was nothing for either one of them. But remember at that time, all we had were landlines and phone books. So it costs extra to even have your number unlisted. Now, I'm telling my age right here, but it really did cost a lot of money, and nobody in that just had an average income usually had their phone number unlisted. That was, that was a privilege, you know, an extra goodie, that costs more money.

**Bruce Fischer:** Yeah, we are thinking but you know, at different times, now you have to think back during that time frame. I do remember the, you know, the phone books, we don't even get them, the houses anymore. But as a young person back then I do remember that those charges for unlisted numbers, it was like wow, that guy's got an unlisted number. It was like a status symbol to be able to un-list your number.

**Tammy Alexander:** You know, you had to pay for it, but to your point about the phone books, the phone books were the only way that we had to find phone numbers. I mean, we lived by the phone books, there was always one by your phone, you know, and then new one came out every year. But, you had to have the phone book in order to be able to find people.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right, I think that people forget that too, and when you're researching cases like this, you're dealing with the technology of that, of that time.

**Tammy Alexander:** Right.

**Bruce Fischer:** It's interesting. We heard both Jamie and Howard talk about the reward money and both of them said that people would be motivated to turn Jamie in for that money. Can you tell us again about the reward money? How much was it? Where it came from or where it possibly went?



**Tammy Alexander:** Well, initially, there was a \$2,500 Crime Stoppers reward in this case. And then in 1993, Mitsubishi put up a \$5,000 reward in addition to the \$2,500 reward, so there was what, \$7,500 out there that we just don't know where it went. We've searched for the information many times over the years and not had any results. We filed FOIAs, lengthy FOIAs appeals with the AG. I mean, we've, we've done everything that we can think of to do, and there has never, never been any results of what happened to that reward money. Every witness in this case testified that they received nothing in return for their testimony. So it's as if it just disappeared into, into thin air.

**Bruce Fischer:** Was this money given to the police department to hold on to or did Mitsubishi say that they would disperse the money or do we not have any of those details at all?

**Tammy Alexander:** I think at one point, it came to light that Mitsubishi had sent them a check.

**Bruce Fischer:** Okay. They actually gave the money, Crime Stoppers and Mitsubishi gave the money, and then it just disappeared.

**Tammy Alexander:** Yeah, so it's very muddy, though, you know, we're not, we're not exactly sure. There may be a chance of finding out, like, who Mitsubishi gave that money to like, but I, I'm, I seem to recall that Mitsubishi sent someone in the Bloomington Police Department.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right.

**Tammy Alexander:** I'm not saying that they wrote a check to Katz. I'm saying...

**Bruce Fischer:** Of course...

**Tammy Alexander:** You know, they sent it.

**Bruce Fischer:** The point being is that the money was given from Crime Stoppers and Mitsubishi, that money was given to the police department and there's no accountability for it.

**Tammy Alexander:** Yeah, if I recall correctly, there's also no accountability for the \$2,500 on Crime Stoppers. Crime Stoppers is insane in a way because they can just hide everything. And it's under the umbrella, which they try to say that they're separate organizations. But it's under the umbrella of the police department. The police department has a part in deciding who gets Crime Stopper money. How could they not? I mean, the crime, the Crime Stoppers board has to get that information from someone. They have to evaluate how to divide reward money up when there's multiple tips that lead to an arrest or conviction.

**Bruce Fischer:** Of course and their information is coming from the police department.

**Tammy Alexander:** And everything that they tell us every time is that the police department doesn't have anything to do with Crime Stoppers. And I'm like, well then how do you, how are you figuring out who to give money to?

**Bruce Fischer:** Right. There's the mystery there. That's the, you know, questions you've been trying to get answered for years now.

**Tammy Alexander:** Well, they push it to Crime Stoppers and then Crime Stoppers says, well, we're a nonprofit and we're a separate entity and our whole thing is about confidentiality. People use Crime Stoppers all the time. Family members call when they're, when they're family member is ready to turn themselves in, the family member will call another family member will call and they'll get the money.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right.

**Tammy Alexander:** I mean, it's, uh, you know, in a way of racket. You know, people use it for every single thing that they can, but the, not frequently that person is hidden away. And you got to dig and dig and dig.

**Bruce Fischer:** Entirely different story that needs more investigation just like many other things.

**Tammy Alexander:** Yes.

**Bruce Fischer:** So when we look at Randy Howard, what were his motivations to make up such a story like this? The other informants, they were threatened with

consequences and prison time for not cooperating, but Howard didn't admit to being threatened. How did they get him to comply so easily?

**Tammy Alexander:** Well, I mean, and I think that it being illustrated you know, that maybe he did. He complied easy in the interviews and he complied easy in the police reports. But he was a nonpaid informant. I mean, he, he admitted at trial that he was paid to get information during that time. And he was a known-paid informant and it was really as simple as that. We don't know that he had any charges pending against him, but this is what he did. He did it multiple times. I mean, he told Jamie that he, you know, he testified that he confessed, that Jamie confessed to him the day after the crime. And he, and he admits in this grand jury testimony that he called Crime Stoppers and, and volunteered a bunch of information um, about other crimes.

And then he was in the police department giving a statement on April 11, 10 days after the crime. 10 days after the crime, he was in there and he was saying Jamie did this and Keneally did this and all of these different people did all of these different crimes. And he never said one thing about Jamie confessing him at the bus station. So, believe me if he would have had that information, he would have used it because he would have gotten a lot more money for that murder than he had gotten during that time. But I think it was \$500 is what they ended up saying that he got, that he admitted that he got. He was a paid informant and that, that I mean, it's really is as simple as that.

**Bruce Fischer:** Yeah, this one seems pretty cut and dry. I mean, it just looks like this guy's out for money and you'll say whatever he needs to say to get the money.

**Tammy Alexander:** Yep. And they knew who to go to, didn't they?

**Bruce Fischer:** They did. In Howard's affidavit he talks about jurors conduct, specifically to jurors he recognized and even one Jamie supposedly ridiculed in school, and another claimed he may have burglarized her house when he was a kid. He said he reported it to Jamie's defense. Can you tell us more about that situation?

**Tammy Alexander:** We don't really know. That situation has not been explored. If we had gotten an evidentiary hearing, then we could have gotten discovery and gotten to the bottom of it. If they did have a beef or an earlier connection, that's jury misconduct, and that's something that you know, should be known. That's another reason to have an evidentiary hearing so we can have access to records because

really it's just a matter of interviewing those jurors or getting to the bottom of the crime. I think one of them was in the grand jury, and I think there was another one that was in his, in his trial jury. So I think those were two different incidences. But still, I mean, that's why we need an evidentiary hearing so we can get to the bottom of those statements, whether they're, whether they're true or not, but at least we would know.

**Bruce Fischer:** This part is amazing to me. I think it really highlights on the small town aspect of it. How does this guy know two people in the jury?

**Tammy Alexander:** I mean, that's a good question.

**Bruce Fischer:** It's amazing to me.

**Tammy Alexander:** I mean, that's a very good question. I don't know. Do we, do we even know that that's true?

**Bruce Fischer:** Right. This guy is a conartist, how do we even know if he's telling the truth? It just, it just caught me I'm like, how the hell does this guy know two people in a jury?

**Tammy Alexander:** Right.

**Bruce Fischer:** I mean, how small is the town I mean, there's, there's still a population there. We're not talking about Mayberry. Close.

**Tammy Alexander:** One of the first time I went to Bloomington, I was so surprised at how big it was because of the way that gossip spreads around there, you know, that I'd seen from my end from even Tennessee. And from reading the police documents, you can see it. But yeah, I was amazed that wow, you know, it's much bigger than where I live.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right.

**Tammy Alexander:** You know, the town I live in.

**Bruce Fischer:** I'm just not sure how credible that could possibly be that this guy knows two of them. And if he does, it just highlights that the, the small-town

atmosphere.

**Tammy Alexander:** Yeah, well, you know, and that's another reason to give an evidentiary hearing to at least vet that out.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right.

**Tammy Alexander:** Find out.

**Bruce Fischer:** And that's one of your arguments over the years, how, how can Jamie have possibly gone this long without getting at least one evidentiary hearing?

**Tammy Alexander:** That's crazy.

**Bruce Fischer:** When we look at the Howard's 2009 affidavit, it was not as compelling as the Ed Palumbo or Steve Scheel's statements. He did not admit to making up a false confession or having a hand and taking Jamie's life. He simply said he just agreed to whatever they wanted him to say. But he had so much more detail but other things you recall that the trial about Detective Barkes, the vendetta against Jamie. He still even claimed that they were in the car together. What is the significance of this affidavit as it stands? And has it been effective in uh Jamie's defense?

**Tammy Alexander:** I mean nothing has been effective because, again, we haven't had an evidentiary hearing. That's what the evidentiary hearing is for, to examine and cross examine these witnesses that have given affidavits. And we just haven't had that opportunity. It's only as, I mean, of course, we haven't been granted relief. So to that end, it hasn't been effective. But, if it gets in front of the right judge that actually sees this, then maybe they would at least kick it back for an evidentiary hearing so we could vet all this stuff out.

**Bruce Fischer:** Yeah, this stuff would be torn apart by a good attorney and in an evidentiary hearing, there's no doubt about that.

**Tammy Alexander:** Right.

**Bruce Fischer:** We just need to get to that point. Lesley, in episode three we heard Prosecutor Teena Griffin tell the jury during her closing arguments that Jamie

probably tucked his hair up under his cap so he could change his appearance, and that it was Randy Howard that made this claim. Where did this story originate from and how did it spiral?

**Lesley Pires:** Howard first brings this up and is 1999 recorded audio interview. He says, when the first drawing came out, everyone said it looked just like Jamie but I couldn't pin it on him. But I remember years after one of Jamie's trademark things to do, when he didn't want to be seen was put a baseball cap over his hair. Then he looked more like the picture. Then when he gets to the grand jury, he elaborates on that even more, and now he creates a memory of how Jamie liked to put his hair under his cap as a joke, and how unrecognizable he was and he said exactly this on the stand. One thing Jamie did do is when he didn't want to be recognized, he pulled his hair up under his hat and you couldn't tell who it was. Matter of fact, the first time I seen him in probably five, six years, he did that when he came over, knocked on my door for the first time. I didn't know who it was. And then he finally pulled the hat off. And you know, we went from there. When I remembered that, I came back up here and volunteered that information.

However, at the trial two years later, he's not so keen on that story anymore. He hears the defense object to the prosecutor's use of the word trademark, which was his exact word he used to describe the hat being a disguise. And he picks up on that issue real quick, and he changes the significance of the story, of the story immediately. Now he says, I would not call it a trademark. One time he showed up at my house in a baseball cap with it severely pulled down. I didn't see him in years. So it was a surprise visit. I answered the door. I didn't know who it was and he pulled the hat back and it was Jamie, so we went on from there.

So, then Howard also makes a big deal about what the composite drawing has to do with the hat. But he really contradicts himself. During his tape interview, he told Detective Barkes that quote, "One of them looked nothing like him when he took his hat off." But one week later, he tells the grand jury that the sketch with the hat doesn't look like Jamie at all, and that the sketch that did look like him had no hat. He says that the sketch with the hat is inaccurate because the nose is wrong, and in fact it looks more like someone else he knows. At Jamie's trial, two years later, he tells a story about how Jamie was worried about the sketch looking like him, but he refuses to admit that he agreed to that.

He's riding the fence here. It's obvious. He's literally saying the opposite at different times. When he's asked about the composite, he says it doesn't look like Jamie. But when he's asked about what Jamie says to him, he says Jamie thought it looked like him. I think it's because he made up the whole conversation, the whole hair under the hat thing, and when they present the sketches to him in court, they obviously don't look like Jamie. And he can tell what's going on. He can tell how those little lies he said to Barkes are now becoming big testimonial statements against Jamie. So he's really trying to be evasive and say what he was supposed to say, but not really stay married to his own narrative, and it's because he's lying about it all.

**Bruce Fischer:** The prosecution needed to put a revolver in Jamie's hand. How did they do this?

**Lesley Pires:** Howard said during his 1999 interview, that Jamie had several guns and kept them stashed in his trailer and talked about them a lot. He said he got the gun and sold it to Jamie for 25 bucks, who then sold it to his uncle. He elaborates later and says that he kept the gun at his house and Jamie used to come over to borrow it and just play with it. But Jamie was possessive of it. And he got tired of keeping it. So that's how he convinced him to get rid of it. Then, one week later, he told the grand jury they acquired the gun together. They were hanging out in Jamie went behind a store to pee and they just decided to pry the door open back there, and they went in and stole some stuff including a .38 from behind the register.

He puts himself as the owner of the weapon, saying he kept it at his house and loaned it out. But somehow this is used to insinuate that Jamie had access to a revolver and was really possessive of it, when Howard is the one in custody of the supposed murder weapon and gets it back from Jamie and talks Jamie into getting rid of it. It really doesn't make any sense. If he had the murder weapon, why is he not a suspect? Obviously because he's a paid informant. Otherwise, this would have been unacceptable. Also, if Jamie sold the murder weapon to his uncle for 25 bucks, why did they not go to his uncle's house and raid it for weapons? It makes no sense.

**Bruce Fischer:** So far you've noted a lot of inconsistencies in Howard's testimony. Are there other inconsistencies to note?

**Lesley Pires:** Yeah, definitely. In April of 1991, just 11 days after the Clark shooting robbery, he is in the police station giving information about other robberies and he says nothing about the Clark Station, robbery or shooting at all. He mentions Jamie

and gives information about some other robberies he knows about but he never mentions the shooting or the murder. Now, eight years later in his 1999 interview that's recorded, the only motive he can offer up for Jamie killing a kid is that he thinks Jamie's wife was having an affair with the 17-year-old victim, Bill Little. And that must be why Jamie shot him and only got \$40. Then the next week, he tells the grand jury that Jamie was actually going there to commit an armed robbery. But he thinks that he said the gun going off was an accident.

So then two years later when he gets to the actual trial, he says it now he's 90% sure Jamie did not say anything about a robbery at all. So Teena Griffin, the prosecutor keeps pestering him and asking him, "Well didn't you mention it during your taped, recorded interview two years ago?" But the truth from that audio, he said he knew there were armed robberies going on back then. And he never really comes out and says Jamie said he did an armed robbery at the Clark Station against Bill Little. And Detective Barkes even keeps referring to the Clark Station as a shooting, not an armed robbery. But Griffin insists, so Howard literally says on the stand, "I recall that conversation was at 5:30 in the morning, which I hadn't even thought about this in two years. So if I would have known we would end up here today, I would have said things a lot differently. The only reason why I keep remembering is because you keep telling me I said it."

There's also the issue of Jamie's demeanor. It seems Howard was trying to say Jamie was playing a joke on him in the car by pretending he just did the big shooting that was in the newspaper in his 1999 interview. He says that Jamie was very animated and loud and acting the part and using hand movements, but then played it off immediately, probably because he could tell his distaste with the situation. He then offers this comment and it gets really twisted later. But he said Jamie was upset because his life was going down the hole. At the grand jury a week later, he says Jamie was just playing a role really loudly and actually turned around and said, I'm joking. He says the same at the trial, telling the prosecutor Jamie was not upset, he didn't make that comment about his life going down the hole. But we did hear in the audio, he did say it. And it seems like now he doesn't want to tell that lie anymore, at the actual trial where he's under oath.

It's even more obvious he didn't really want to be involved in this as deep as a got, because at the grand jury, he interrupted the examination to say, "I honestly think he just wanted to get a rise out of me. And I think if he did honestly do it, I don't think he would have said a word. He definitely wouldn't have said something like that." So it



seems to me that this whole time, he's they're saying what he was coached to say. But he's keen to how much trouble he's causing with these little lies he made up. And he's trying to backtrack now, and correct himself on the stand.

**Tammy Alexander:** But the thing about this, is this whole scenario that he's saying, well he didn't say it like this, and he said it like this, and we were in the car and when I picked him up. That never happened. He never even picked him up at the, at the bus station. Jamie didn't have a phone. There was no way to call him. Jamie didn't have a car. There's no way to go pick him up. He ran into him literally years later, and saw him and they were just like, wow, you've really grown up because the guy was a lot younger than him.

And the whole thing about him bringing up Tammy, he was upset in '93 when they were in prison because Tammy was, had an affair with someone and says that it was Bill Little and that's how they knew him, and he even says in that interview, uh how did it, how did he know Bill Little they went to high school together. Bill Little was in middle school when Tammy was in high school and Jamie in high school. I mean he was that much younger than them. It's, it's absurd. You know, he just, he just pulled that out of his hat just like he pulled out them going to pick him up at the bus station. If he had picked Jamie up at the bus station, he would have said it in that 1991 interview ten days after Jamie allegedly confessed to him. He would have been like, yeah, I picked him up at the gas station and he told me did the Clark Station thing.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right. Well, it's fresh in his memory.

**Tammy Alexander:** Give me my \$2,500.

**Bruce Fischer:** That's when his memory would have been fresh on that whole thing.

**Tammy Alexander:** Exactly.

**Bruce Fischer:** And he didn't say a word about it.

**Tammy Alexander:** He did not say a word about it. Nothing.

**Bruce Fischer:** You know for me I know there's a lot of ridiculous things here, but for me the elephant in the room is Jamie didn't have a car.

**Tammy Alexander:** He didn't have a car and he, and he didn't have a phone. You have to understand when somebody says they called you that means they called your house.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right.

**Tammy Alexander:** There's just-

**Bruce Fischer:** We have to think once again, we have to think back on the technology. It was a landline.

**Tammy Alexander:** He said he called Jamie. Now, you can use a pay phone. We used pay phones a lot back then. But, he said that he called Jamie to come pick him up at the bus station. When they hadn't even seen him, Jamie hadn't even seen him since the kid was like nine or ten. You know this is that many years later. So, there's no, there's no reason for Howard to even call him and say, you know, come pick me up at the bus station in the first place. And that scenario just doesn't flush out at all. And all of this testimony in this, this scenario that Lesley just laid out, all of it is, is not credible at all, even though you know he's changing his story about something that didn't even happen in the first place. That's the absurdity of it to me.

**Lesley Pires:** Yeah, and I really enjoy listening to Detective Barkes while he's interviewing him a week before the grand jury trial in 1999. Because, when he brings that up about the affair with Tammy or these other absurd little lies, when Barkes doesn't like what he's hearing he ignores it. They just act like that part of the conversation didn't happen and then Barkes will ask a very long question rephrasing it, you know with the answer that he wants in the question, so all he has to do is say yes, and then keeps talking and talking at the end of the interview and giving them more and more information. Barkes just says, okay, this interview has been terminated at this time. They knew exactly what they wanted to get. They ignored all the stuff that didn't make sense and they controlled the whole interview. I mean, that whole interview should have been played at trial. I don't understand that.

**Tammy Alexander:** Right. And if they, if he had said, you notice what they picked and, and chose to say at trial, there was so much more that he said that was inconsistent. Jamie's attorney should have brought that out. They only picked

whatever was gonna to support their theory and then left everything else out of it because he said so much, so many things that didn't even make sense.

**Lesley Pires:** Well, what I want to know is, how did he get interviewed one week before the grand jury testimony when the grand jury was already, they were already convened. They were already other witnesses ahead of him, so it's like in the middle of it they just go find him and decide, oh, we need this guy and we're going to put him on last. And they put him up there on the last day with a bunch of people. So how is that even enough time for the defense to review what he was gonna say?

**Tammy Alexander:** There's no defense at a, at the grand jury.

**Lesley Pires:** Oh, all right. Well, I guess so I guess that's the purpose of the grand jury to see what he's gonna say.

**Tammy Alexander:** That's why it's so easy to indict somebody because there's no defense. There's no defense on a grand jury. They just lay out the case and say, do you think there's enough evidence for this to go to trial?

**Bruce Fischer:** Right, the bar is pretty low.

**Tammy Alexander:** Very low.

**Bruce Fischer:** Lesley how did Jamie's attorney Frank Picl do this time when questioning Howard on the stand?

**Lesley Pires:** I thought Picl did a good job. But honestly, it's because Howard made it so easy for him. I did mention a little while ago about how Howard picked up that Picl didn't want him to admit that he used the word trademark. And that was kind of like a climactic event because by this time Howard was so sick and tired of the prosecutor trying to read back what he said during the recorded interview. So by the time Picl came halfway through, he was almost relieved and just decided he's going to say whatever Picl wants him to say and he totally switches.

So Picl gets him to admit that both the composites look nothing like Jamie. And that they don't now either. And he gets him to say that since he was in the car with him 24 hours after the crime, he can vouch for his appearance and what he looked like the day after the crime, is nothing like those sketches of the person who Gutierrez

and Luna saw and Martinez saw, supposedly at the gas station that night. They get him to say he was in the car with him the day after the crime and he had a full beard, and those sketches don't have a full beard. So that was really good. And he also got him to admit clearly that he did not take Jamie seriously and that he thought the whole conversation was meaningless.

So the prosecution tries to redirect after that, and pulls out the mug shot pictures again, and tries to get Howard to say that the mug shots are accurate portrayals of how Jamie looked around the time the crime. But Picl able to re-cross again and he makes him say that no, his recollection of Jamie in the car the next day is more accurate than those mug shots that were taken at a later date, and that his face was heavier and that he had a full beard the next day. So that's important, because the prosecution had always tried to say Jamie could have been the man in the composite if he had shaved his beard and only had stubble. So even in Susan Claycombs trial, they're arguing with the witnesses on the stand about how much stubble was on Jamie's face. And again, with Martinez at Jamie's trial. So that was, you know, really important. Um, and Howard is saying he saw him in person, and that it's just not true. And he gets Howard to say again, that he only believes Jamie was trying to get a rise out of him when he told him the story about the Clark Station shooting and that was the last question that he answered on the stand, was Jamie was just trying to get a rise out of me.

So to me it seems that Picl did a good job at discrediting him because Howard willingly agreed to all his questions in support of Jamie not making the confession. I mean, I think Howard was sitting on the fence playing both sides out of obligation to being a paid informant. And when he took the stand he tried to muddle his responses and not completely throw Jamie under the bus. But he also didn't admit to making anything up either, like the whole car ride. He just played coy about it. And it would go a long way now if he would write in that affidavit the truth about the whole car ride event and if it actually ever took place.

**Bruce Fischer:** You know I think with Randy Howard we've laid out all these details pretty well. This might be the easiest one yet. I mean, this guy has zero credibility. Is there anything else that we should add?

**Lesley Pires:** It was just really obvious that the three witnesses that we talked about the last three episodes, when they're lying on the fly like that, they all have a similar pattern as to how they go about it. So Randy Howard, Ed Palumbo, Steve Scheel,

they first start by giving a very vague casual confession. Both of them, all of them say it was five to 10 minutes, and then they can only give quick snippets of words that Jamie supposedly said in the confession. You know, this time Randy is saying Randy Howard saying, I fucked up I shot the kid. And then if you remember, you have Ed Palumbo saying, gun goes off, boom, boom kid dies. And then Steve Scheel just saying, yeah, I did the shooting, you know, at a party and that's it.

So they, they do that, and then they offer some kind of doubt to the authenticity at the end, all three of them saying I wasn't sure if I believed him or not. So that way they can, you know, always give themselves an out when they go on the stand. Maybe because they know they're lying or maybe because they don't want to feel as bad for what they're doing. Maybe both. Um, but you know, it's just important to note that's a third witness who's doing the exact same thing.

**Tammy Alexander:** You know the fact that he said, what, what you referenced, Lesley, "I recall that conversation was at 5:30 in the morning which I hadn't even thought about this in two years, so if I would have known we would have ended up here today, I would have said things a lot differently." What does that even mean? I would have told the truth or I would have lied, or I would have, you know, it's just all over the place. I would have said things a lot differently. The only reason why I keep remembering it, is because you keep telling me I said it.

**Lesley Pires:** Exactly. I think I know what that means. He is saying exactly that. If I had known I was gonna be here today on the stand, and the money you gave me was gonna come back to haunt me, and I was gonna have to put a man in jail over this, for real, I wouldn't have said it. I think that's exactly what he means. And maybe he can't remember what he said because he was lying or maybe he just doesn't want to lie anymore. Um, but he is confessing on the stand.

**Tammy Alexander:** That's pretty amazing. It's a pretty amazing comment.

**Lesley Pires:** I don't know why Frank Picl didn't pick up on that, and maybe he was just really happy that it was going his way so he didn't have to be aggressive with him, um, but the other witnesses he was like, oh, but you took a guilty plea, so the day you said you were not guilty, you were a liar, and you weren't a good citizen. But then when you said you were guilty, you're telling the truth. So which is it? Are you a liar or are you a good citizen? So why didn't he say that to him? This is the guy you would want to say that too.

**Bruce Fischer:** Right? Howard voluntarily discredited himself on the stand, if that's the way we're reading that, he admitted fully right there that he would have said things completely differently at different times.

**Tammy Alexander:** It's crazy.

**Lesley Pires:** And that's how they got away with it.

**Bruce Fischer:** That's right.

**Lesley Pires:** In this episode, we showed you how money talks. Childhood friend Randy Howard turned to police informant, piled on Jamie, and made up a story about his old friend giving him a ride, while joking about a breaking news story. He collected \$500 from Detective Thomas Russell, you may remember from episode five, the one who changed his testimony replacing the word robbery with murder, who insinuated consciousness of guilt to the jury. The reward money that publicly funded these informants remains unaccounted for today, 29 years after the crime.

If you have any information that may help Jamie, please call the tip line at 888-710-SNOW. There's 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. But believe it or not, these fabricated casual confessions did not stop with this third snitch. While Jamie was incarcerated, the informants on the inside took a stab at it to. How did Bill Moffit get away with it? That's next time on Snow Files.

*Transcribed by: Melinda Wargacki*

---

© 2020 Snow Files. All Rights Reserved.