



Injustice Anywhere

an organization working to correct wrongful convictions

Injustice Anywhere Newsletter

Spring 2014



- [What's Next For Amanda & Raffaele](#)
- [Jeffrey Havard Update](#)
- [Nyki Kish Appeal Outcome](#)
- [Kirstin Lobato Update](#)
- [The Future For Debra Milke](#)
- [Does Innocence Matter In The Jamie Snow Case?](#)
- [Our New Featured Cases](#)
- [Injustice Anywhere Network](#)

May 6, 2014

By Bruce Fischer

Injustice Anywhere is pleased to publish our second newsletter. We have come a long way, thanks to an amazing group of dedicated volunteers, but we still have a long way to go. With your help we can achieve our goals.

Please take time to review our eight featured cases highlighted in this newsletter. Our organization has done extensive research on these cases, and great care has been taken when deciding where to direct our efforts.

We also encourage you to visit the [Injustice Anywhere Forum](#). Our forum members discuss a wide range of topics involving wrongful convictions.

Be sure to listen to our recent Injustice Anywhere Radio broadcast. We highlighted our featured cases, giving an up to date review of each case. In recent months we have had one featured case end in success, and we have added two new featured cases. You can listen to all of our shows in the [archive](#).

We would like to thank everyone that contributes to Injustice Anywhere, and we encourage Injustice Anywhere supporters to distribute this newsletter. We understand the challenges some may face when attempting to start a conversation about a wrongful conviction case. This newsletter is a great way to tell your friends and family about our organization, and may help to open the door to further conversation about a case or cases that you are interested in.

Amanda Knox & Raffaele Sollecito



In December of 2009, Amanda Knox & Raffaele Sollecito were wrongfully convicted for the murder of Meredith Kercher. Both were declared innocent on appeal and were released from prison in 2011. The Italian Supreme Court overturned the acquittals in 2013, and guilty verdicts were reinstated in January of this year. Amanda and Raffaele will now appeal their case to the Italian Supreme Court.

What's Next For Raffaele Sollecito and Amanda Knox

By Karen Pruett

Raffaele and Amanda have battled against the Italian criminal justice system since their arrest on November 6, 2007, and the fact remains that there never has been hard evidence against either university student. The real killer, a local burglar named Rudy Guede, left evidence all over Meredith Kercher, her bedroom (the murder scene) and the apartment she shared with three other women, including Amanda. Rather than quick justice for an easy-to-solve murder the world witnessed an example of the abuses rained down upon the Italian people from a 1989 Reform of their legal system.

This reform created a new position in the judiciary, Public Prosecutor, and gave that person complete control over the Investigative Phase of a crime. But in practice giving one person so much power opens the door for abuse and the Italian system is rife with examples of the public prosecutors pandering to favorite lawyers, plaintiffs or defendants. Attorneys on the "opposing" side suffered as well, often walking a fine line so they didn't become defendants themselves fighting a trumped up charge. In Amanda and Raffaele's situation they became the victims of manipulated evidence and their lawyers are walking that fine line. Not only that, but the Defense has been denied access to a semen-stained pillowcase, computer hard drives and DNA records since 2007. First the Perugian courts and then the Florentine court denied them due process.

Theirs is a textbook example of what the Italian people face everyday.

Perugia's then Public Prosecutor, Giuliano Mignini, conducted the 2007 investigation into Meredith Kercher's murder and his own public record shows decades of abusing the inviolable rights of Perugian citizens and foreigners. He is fully aware that if factually incorrect paperwork is filed during an investigation it becomes literally "set in stone" if the judges agree with him, as demonstrated with Raffaele and Amanda's 2008 pre-trial and 2009 First Instance trial. Like a boulder rolling downhill, it becomes easier and faster to pass the case along uncorrected. Meredith Kercher's murder investigation illustrated every attribute of Mignini's past behaviors and while most outsiders thought that the thinly veiled duplicity was obvious, we were stunned when Italy's highest courts chose ignore an investigation that was as fraudulent as it was insidious. It became clear that the high courts will not or cannot amend factually incorrect case files leading to the frightening understanding that citizens and foreigners alike could be at the mercy of official corruption.

The 2011 Appeal is, so far, the only court who found a way to side-step this popularity contest to get at the truth. It paid careful attention to the law and released the defendants when it was concluded that the evidence against them should never have been entered into court record in the first place. Rudy Guede's DNA did not belong in Meredith's bedroom, there is no evidence of other perpetrators, therefore he alone killed her. That is painfully obvious. Two judges out of more than twenty adhered to Italy's laws which demonstrates the strength of the prosecution's "Current," a type of political party within the Italian judicial system. This powerful "Current" has favored the prosecution all levels, criminal and civil, except during the First Appeal.

At all but one trial the court ignored the scientifically supported fact that neither defendant has any hard evidence against them.

Raffaele Sollecito and Amanda Knox (continued)



Amanda Knox & Raffaele Sollecito

On April 29th, Judge Alessandro Nencini released his Motivation Document explaining his reasoning for the guilty verdicts. The document is currently being translated and should be available in English shortly. Not surprisingly, translated excerpts already show that Nencini's report works to add more illogical conclusions to the Mt. Everest of factually incorrect information in the case file.

During the summer of 2014 the Defense will file an appeal. Once again they will ask for long-denied access to evidence and tell the court that the defendants were not present when Rudy Guede killed Meredith Kercher. Once again they will say that the interrogations of the innocent students were coercive and prejudiced.

In the fall of 2014, the date for the Supreme Court hearing will be announced, and it will likely convene in Rome in early 2015. The Supreme Court will make a final decision on the litigation or send it back down to the appeal level for another review. But this case has become a popularity contest and with the prosecutor's party wearing the crown, some expect the highest court in the land to bow to the lowest court's original decision citing the inability to correct mistakes. I guess the Supreme Court is not powerful enough to fix the mess a simple prosecutor made, how about that?

A final "guilty" ruling would mean that Raffaele could go back to prison while the system completely destroys his life; his assets will be seized. And even if the system frees him a month or year later, he would emerge from prison with his reputation and finances in ruins. A promising life burned at the stake of Vanity and Avarice.

Amanda would become a fugitive if the final ruling is "guilty" and at some point Italy could make the decision to seek her extradition. Both the American judiciary and State Department would review Amanda's case after a formal request from Italy, but the final decision would rest with the State Department. It's highly unlikely that she would be simply handed over because of the prejudicial treatment by the Italian court system. Her fugitive status would mean she would not be able to travel in any country with an extradition treaty with Italy, effectively cutting her off from Europe and her family in Germany.

An appeal gives both Meredith's family and the defendants another chance to find justice.

In Italy cases can bounce between the Supreme Court and the Appeal level several times. Italian film star Sophia Loren won a tax evasion case in 2013; it had been in the system for 40 years. It's easy to see how defendants can be financially devastated and their cases end in attrition or prison or both due to no fault of their own. Ideally the Supreme Court could end this farce by doing a few simple things. First request a third appeal and ask for a complete review of all the evidence, including the contested and long-denied items. Do an Osmotic Evaluation, then do Reverse Osmosis and present only the hard evidence to the court. By simply allowing Italian law to work without hindrance I think the resulting ruling would be in everyone's best interests. The Kercher's will know the full truth surrounding Meredith's tragic death. Amanda and Raffaele will be exonerated. Rudy Guede will serve a full prison sentence for taking Meredith's life. Then, one can only hope, the Supreme Court would open an investigation into the behavior of the Perugian authorities who fraudulently cost the Italian taxpayers millions and caused the needless suffering of three innocent families.

Raffaele Sollecito and Amanda Knox (continued)



Meredith Kercher

Meredith Kercher's family, firmly on the side of the prosecution, is happy with the guilty verdicts. They have long held the belief that Meredith's friends were involved in her death but all they really want is justice for her. The defendants want justice for Meredith too, but more importantly they want the Kercher's to recognize that the hard evidence clearly shows they were not involved with her murder.

Raffaele Sollecito is trapped in Italy; his passport has been seized. This now 30-year-old young man has shown remarkable resilience in his steadfast pursuit of the truth. Raffaele is witness to his own country violating his inviolable rights, a country that sees him only as a cash cow. Yet he continues to stand up to the criminal justice system and the powerful Currents within. It's a rare thing to see a mild-mannered person with such strength against nearly impossible odds; perhaps the media should take note of that instead of whom Raffaele is dating.

Amanda Knox's behavior has been the topic of conversation for years; but nowhere in that discussion is criticism for the behavior of Giuliano Mignini and other top Perugian officials. One would think the "video camera" in Mignini's Reefer Madness brain would be far more interesting than measuring the amount of Amanda's crying, hugging and kissing.

It's painfully obvious that in context Amanda was grieving for her friend while Mignini was thinking about Meredith's naked body. Amanda, Raffaele and Guede's naked bodies too when one considers the content of Mignini's theories.

Rudy Guede will be eligible for work release in May of 2014; the "model prisoner" has been taking classes and preparing for reentering society. Portrayed as the "poor black boy" by the prosecution, it is therefore curious that Guede has one of the most expensive and well-connected lawyers in Perugia and that he is being protected from the intrusive media. For those who understand the manner in which Guede took Meredith's life, his callous behavior afterward and how quickly he sided with the prosecutors, well...it should be obvious that the Perugians cut him a deal. But why? Why protect so obvious a murderer?

The lesson learned is that protecting the well-connected murderer is more important than justice for the British exchange student he killed. And we learned that the most vulnerable citizens will be used to distract the public from a killer. We learned that Raffaele and Amanda's case has proved to be a political football and sadly justice for Meredith cannot occur as long as the court system continues to pander to the real killer, Rudy Guede. If Italy frees him and jails innocent students simply to make a point, how can any citizen or foreigner feel safe within its borders? Will there ever be justice for Meredith, Amanda and Raffaele?

Visit these important links to keep up to date with Amanda and Raffaele's case

- [Injustice in Perugia](#): an website detailing the wrongful conviction of Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito
- [AmandaKnox.com](#): Amanda Knox's personal website
- [Murder of Meredith Kercher](#) a website providing case documents, transcripts, and expert analysis
- [G-Man Case File](#): retired FBI Agent Steve Moore – advocate, commentator, author

Jeffrey Havard



Jeffrey Havard currently sits wrongfully convicted on death row in Mississippi for the sexual assault and murder of his girlfriend's six-month-old daughter, Chloe Britt. The truth is the infant slipped from Jeffrey's arms while lifting her from the tub, causing her head to hit the toilet. Chloe's death was a tragic accident, not a murder. Jeffrey is innocent.

New evidence is now available that proves Jeffrey's innocence. Advocacy efforts are needed to bring more attention to this case to help encourage the Federal Court of Appeals to grant Jeffrey Havard a new trial.

All the Experts Agree: Jeffrey Havard Was Convicted of a Crime That Didn't Happen - The State Says We Should Kill Him Anyway

By Jen Fitzgerald

In November of 2013, Jeffrey Havard filed a motion for relief from Judgment based on newly discovered evidence; the newly discovered evidence includes affidavits from 4 of the nation's leading medical and biomechanical experts, all of whom reviewed the evidence in his case and all of whom expressed opinions that the child Jeffrey was convicted of murdering most likely died from an accidental fall and NOT from shaken baby syndrome, just like Jeffrey has always maintained. Dr. Hayne, who testified as an Expert for the State at the time of trial also submitted an affidavit. Dr. Hayne testified at trial that the child died due to shaken baby syndrome; in his affidavit; however, Dr. Hayne stated that due to recent advances in biomechanical science, he now believes that the child died by either "Shaken baby plus impact or blunt force trauma." In other words, the child's injuries could not have occurred by shaking alone, but would've had to have involve some sort of impact to her head. Dr. Hayne explained his new opinion to Jerry Mitchell of the Clarion Ledger, and acknowledged that there is "growing evidence" the diagnosis of shaken baby syndrome "is probably not correct." According to an article written by Mitchell and published in the Clarion Ledger less than a month ago, Hayne explained to Mitchell that studies show shaking isn't able to generate enough force to cause these kinds of injuries to a child. Mitchell reported that Hayne "mentioned a 1979 study measuring the falls of children," and stated that "you can generate tremendous G forces in a short distance when you hit a very hard surface." See, *The Death of Chloe Britt: Capital murder or accidental fall?*, published in the Clarion Ledger on 1/20/2014.

On February 5, 2014, the State filed a response to Jeffrey Havard's motion for relief from judgment based on this newly discovered evidence. The state argued that all of the affidavits that Jeff has submitted— every single one of them including Dr. Hayne's — are not "new evidence" under the Mississippi code, and therefore the court cannot even consider them. Jeffrey Havard is time barred and procedurally barred from challenging the child's cause of death because he somehow should have been able to find these experts sooner... He somehow should have been able to get Dr. Hayne to change his mind sooner. The state simply doesn't care that currently, not a single expert who has reviewed this case believes that a crime was even committed; Jeffrey Havard is out of time so Jeffrey Havard must die.

Despite his affidavit and despite what Dr. Hayne told Jerry Mitchell of the Clarion ledger, the state insists that Dr. Hayne's opinion has not changed. According to the state, "Dr. Hayne's July 22, 2013, statement is consistent with his 2002 autopsy report findings and trial testimony." With respect to the four other experts who submitted affidavits, experts including Dr. Michael Baden, Dr. Janice Ophoven, Dr. George Nichols and Dr. Christopher Van Ee (a Dr. of biomechanics) the state does not attempt to discredit their opinions or question whether they are qualified to render those opinions. Instead, the state claims that all of those experts have either testified in other trials or have authored Journal articles around the time of Jeffrey's trial or shortly thereafter, and their testimony and writings were based upon studies which were completed prior to the time of Jeffrey's trial.

Jeffrey Havard (continued)



Jeffrey Havard

The experts, argues the state, have held their opinions about the validity of Shaken Baby Syndrome – or invalidity I should say – for many years. Therefore, this is not new evidence.

"All of [Havard's] expert affidants were either: (a) testifying in a manner entirely consistent with their present sworn statements; (b) relying on "landmark" information published and recognized in the field of biomechanical engineering prior to and / or at the time of [Havard's] trial and/or direct appeal; or, (c) both. The fact that [Havard] has recently discovered it does not make it newly discovered."

The State argues that courts have held that "[W]here a party fails to call a witness who was available during trial, the testimony of that witness cannot be considered newly discovered evidence."

The state makes this argument despite the fact that the Trial court denied Havard's request that an independent medical expert be appointed to assist in his defense. The trial court refused to appoint an independent expert and Jeffrey simply did not have any money with which to hire one.

Apparently the state is arguing that Jeff should have been able to find nationally renowned experts like Dr. Baden, Dr. Ophoven, Dr. Nichols and Dr. Van Ee, from his jail cell, (because the state successfully argued in previous motions that Jeffrey's lawyers were not ineffective for failing to secure an independent expert) and Jeffrey should have been able to convince them to review his case, render an opinion, and come in and testify at his trial, despite the fact that Jeff had no money to pay them. According to the state, these witnesses would have been able to provide the same opinion back in 2002 that they have provided in their affidavits today. For this reason, Jeffrey is time barred and procedurally barred from submitting those affidavits to the court today and the court simply cannot consider them.

The only reason Jeffrey was able to get those experts to look at his case, render an opinion and submit an affidavit is because they agreed to look at his case pro bono, in all likelihood because he is on Death row and his life hangs in the balance. Dr. Baden agreed to first look at the case free of charge when a Clarion Ledger reporter investigating the case asked him to.

Why would the state want to actually kill a man when all of the experts have opined he shouldn't even be in jail? The following quote from the State's written reply to Jeffrey's motion may offer some insight into that question of why: "When balancing [Jeffrey Havard's] interest with the interest of finality, a balance has been struck. Justice does not require petitioner be permitted an opportunity to impeach the evidence supporting his conviction and sentence when that opportunity has been extended multiple times. The [State] submits that granting relief will lead to injustice in this case and in other cases while undermining the public's confidence in the judicial process."

Jeffrey Havard (continued)

So there you have it –adherence procedural rules and time limitations, as well as the state's interest in judgments being final, are more important when weighed against the value of a man's life (a man who even the state's own pathologist doesn't think committed a crime). If the public's confidence in the judicial process is undermined, it won't be because relief was granted to a man who by all expert accounts has been wrongfully convicted. It will be because the state would rather kill a man than admit they made a mistake.

Jen Fitzgerald is an Injustice Anywhere Advisory Board Member, and she is the official spokesperson for Jeffrey Havard. Please visit FreeJeffreyHavard.org for contact information.

Join Our Poster Campaign!

Please share our informational posters and videos for the Jeffrey Havard case. Feel free to share on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Reddit, Pinterest, blogs, and anywhere else that accepts images and videos online.

You can view all of the posters on FreeJeffreyHavard.org



Visit these important links to keep up to date with Jeffrey's case

- [Free Jeffrey Havard](http://FreeJeffreyHavard.org)
- [Jeffrey Havard Facebook group](#)
- [Jeffrey's Change.org petition](#)
- [The wrongful conviction of Jeffrey Havard by Bruce Fischer](#)
- [The Jeffrey Havard case will undermine support for capital punishment by Philip Mause](#)

Nicole "Nyki" Kish



Nyki Kish was wrongfully convicted on March 1, 2011 of second degree murder for the stabbing death of Ross Hammond in Toronto, Canada, on August 8, 2007.

Current status: Two and a half years after Nyki's wrongful conviction, the Ontario Court of Appeals convened on Tuesday October 29th, 2013, to hear Nyki's appeal. The appeal was denied on March 10, 2014.

Update On The Recent Dismissal Of Nicole Kish's Appeal

By Clive Wismayer

In this article I will focus on one aspect of the recent dismissal of Nicole Kish's appeal against her conviction for the second degree murder of 32 year old Ross Hammond on West Queen Street, Toronto on 9th August 2007. My discussion of the trial verdict (see article 'The Case of Nyki Kish') will assist the reader. I begin with this image, an enlarged still taken from crucial CCTV footage of the incident that has been enhanced by an expert in the field.



The entire film, which lasts a few minutes, can be seen online [here](#).

Nicole Kish (continued)



Nicole "Nyki" Kish



Judge Ian Nordheimer

In delivering his verdict, trial judge Ian Nordheimer made sense of the mass of conflicting eye-witness testimony by means of a number of 'irresistible inferences', 'pertinent facts', observations, deductions and rulings that hemmed Kish in as the wielder of the knife that slew Hammond or, as a fall-back position, at least as the person who provided the knife to the actual killer. Thus, he held that:

- only one knife was involved in the incident;
- the knife witnesses Stopford and Paget saw in the female's mouth or hand on one side of the streetcar they were riding was the same one Hammond carried away with him;
- that same knife was responsible for the deep cut to Nicole's arm and also killed Hammond, a fact proven by the presence of their mixed blood at the hinge between blade and handle;
- *Hammond was not carrying a knife when he came into shot in the pasta vid.*
- Faith Watts must have stayed on the south side of the street with Doug Fresh because she was his girlfriend;
- It was not open to the defence to have submitted Faith Watts was the killer because this had not been put to her when she testified at a preliminary hearing;

As the judge considered only 6 candidates as transporters of the knife from the south side of the street to the north, the only person who could have carried it was Nicole - so long, that is, as we airbrush Woolley out of the picture as the appeal judges do or fix any residual problems by casually painting him as Kish's accomplice in murder. As Dranichak decamped and Watts supposedly stayed with Fresh on the south side (a 'fact' which is open to strenuous challenge) and the pasta video shows Hammond with no knife, that only leaves the two of them. According to the appeal judges, the film even shows him uninjured! an astonishing and wholly unwarranted fresh leap into the realms of speculation and wishful thinking designed to shore up an unreasonable verdict.

But, both the trial judge and the appeal judges (and the defence teams too) were *wrong* to imagine they could tell merely from looking at the CCTV footage whether Hammond was armed. They had no expert evidence on the point and failed to understand the need for it. In Rumsfeldian terms, they didn't know what they didn't know. Not only were they unaware of the effect of 'compression' (a process by which the software 'guesses' what it's seeing and overwrites objects with background colouring and texture) but, with expert enhancement, the selected frame appears to show something protruding from Hammond's left hand that could very easily be the blade of a knife.

In other words, the pasta video does not prove to the required standard, or at all, that Hammond did not carry the knife with him across the street. It may, in fact, prove the precise opposite. That single fact blows apart the entire chain of reasoning that begins with the fanciful and unrealistic 'one-knife' theory. It is only one of many angles of attack on this perverse and unfair outcome, unfortunately aided by unwitting defence blunders including unnecessary admissions of strongly disputable facts.

Nicole Kish (continued)

A short list of other candidates for challenge, each worthy of detailed attention, follows (paragraph numbers are taken from the appeal verdict [here](#) - the list is not complete):

1. The appeal judges seem to think Hammond disarmed Nicole while lying on the ground being kicked in the head – para. 38 – but this is not what Melissa Gallately says she saw and her evidence is almost responsible by itself for the conviction.
2. In the same vein, Saad Mir's evidence is said to corroborate Melissa Gallately's (para. 79) but their descriptions of the fight they saw are completely different. From close quarters, he sees a female underneath the male with him sitting on her while Gallately sees Hammond on the ground and the female crouched over him flailing her arms.
3. It is said there is clear evidence that Faith stayed on the south side – para 60. This is a one-eyed reading of Cam Bordignon's evidence. Bordignon did not know Faith and his focus was on the fighting on the other side of the street. His unenthusiastic agreement with a leading question from the crown was apparently enough to fix Faith at the south suggesting, as with so much else, the narrative is driving the evidence rather than the other way around. Moreover, the judges are quite happy to have Faith tending to Nyki's arm on the north side while still tending to Fresh on the south.
4. In paragraph 65 it is said to '*defy logic*' that Woolley would not have stayed to help Fresh if he had at any time been on the south side of the street. The absence of any positive evidence of his presence is thus taken as proof of absence in a confused melée at night. This is arbitrary, perverse and self-serving reasoning. It did not '*defy logic*' that Dranichak would refrain from helping Hammond, even though he certainly was on the south side when they arrived together at the streetcar but his disappearance was not registered by anybody.
5. The quantity of Hammond's blood and its location on Faith Watts' clothing is dismissed as meaningless even though, on the judges' view, she was never involved in any fighting with Hammond at any time – para. 107 (raising the question how she came by a bite mark on her forearm, a mark that was not swabbed for DNA).
6. According to the appeal judges it was Woolley whom Bordignon heard say 'you die tonight' in the middle of the north side fighting – paras.122 and 124. Aside from the fact that no such finding was made by Judge Nordheimer, this begs the question why Woolley, who also received a cut to the arm, was allowed to go free.

Regrettably, assisted by a number of unfortunate and unnecessary defence concessions and oversights, the appeal verdict has only added to the legal sophistry of the trial verdict by fashioning a narrative from arbitrarily selected snippets of evidence, then marrying it to unwarranted deductions and inferences (at least two of which - the other being the blood at the hinge '*irresistible inference*' - lay wholly outside the competence of the judges unaided by expert evidence) to produce a terrible injustice whose result is that Nicole Kish must now remain in jail for who knows how long awaiting a fair-minded review of this incompetently investigated and unfairly tried case.



Visit these important links to keep up to date with Nyki's case

- [Free Nyki Kish](#)
- [Nyki Kish Facebook Page](#)
- [Injustice Anywhere: Nicole "Nyki" Kish](#)
- [The case of Nyki Kish by Clive Wismayer](#)
- [Recent News: Panhandler's friend may have stabbed man in brawl, court told](#)

Kirstin Lobato



Kirstin Lobato was wrongfully convicted of voluntary manslaughter and sexual penetration of a corpse in 2006. There is absolutely no evidence implicating her to the crime and she has a rock solid alibi. The authorities failed to properly investigate this crime leading to a wrongful conviction. Kirstin Lobato is innocent.

Current status: Kirstin is currently waiting for the Nevada Supreme Court to rule on her habeas petition. There is [new evidence](#) in this case that should open the door for a new trial.

Update On The Kirstin Blaise Lobato Case

By Michelle Ravell

There are a few exciting developments over the last few months that we would like to share.

Kirstin's case was selected by Radical Media for a new show called "The System" which will air on Al Jazzerra America. The air date is May 18th, at 9pm. The episode about Kirstin's case is the premier episode. "The System" consists of 8 episodes. Each episode highlights issues within the criminal justice system. Radical Media interviewed many people regarding Kirstin's case including former FBI Agent Steve Moore, Kirstin's attorney JB Afoh-Manin and her local counsel Phung Jefferson. We are excited about this and hope that the episode will help raise public awareness about Kirstin's case in particular and wrongful convictions in general.

Kirstin's petition on [Change.org](#) is still ongoing and has received over 222,000 to date. In case you haven't signed it yet, please make your voice heard. Each signature is emailed to the District Attorney's office. Currently DA Wolfson is running for reelection. The [Justice4Kirstin](#) team does not believe that he should be rewarded with an elected position unless he is willing to fulfill the obligations of the DA's office, which is to seek justice. Seeking justice is in direct conflict with his stance on fighting DNA testing for those convicted of crimes who claim innocence and are asking for a chance to prove it.

We recently discovered that the Nevada Supreme Court has requested oral arguments about Kirstin's Habeas Corpus Appeal. They haven't been scheduled yet, but we are hopeful that this means that the court recognizes that Kirstin could not have been in two places at the same time. We do not yet know what the issue is that they are requesting arguments about. Kirstin's attorney JB Afoh-Manin is excited about the opportunity to fight for Kirstin's freedom.

If you haven't already done so, please join Kirstin's [Facebook Group](#) to get updates about her case. The group also contains files of case transcripts and any new motions or pleadings to the court that are filed are posted there.

The logo for change.org, consisting of the text "change.org" in white lowercase letters on a red rectangular background.

Visit these important links to keep up to date with Kirstin's case

- [Injustice Anywhere](#)
- [Justice For Kirstin](#)
- [Kirstin Lobato's petition](#)
- [A summary of Kirstin Blaise Lobato's innocence by Hans Sherrer](#)
- [The Kirstin Lobato case: an American miscarriage of justice by Joseph Bishop](#)

Debra Jean Milke



Debra Milke was wrongfully convicted and sentenced to death in 1991 in Arizona for the murder of her four-year-old son. Debra is a victim of police negligence and corruption. The only evidence against her was a detective's claim that she provided a non-recorded verbal confession. Debra Milke is innocent.

Current status: Debra's case recently made headlines when the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals overturned her conviction. Debra is currently out of prison on bond awaiting a new trial expected to begin in January, 2015.

Frozen In Arizona

By Luca Cheli

The present state of Debra Milke's proceedings is that she is free on bail (with prohibition to move outside the Maricopa County) until a decision is taken about having a new trial or her charges being dropped.

The theoretical deadline for the Maricopa County Attorneys Office (MCAO) to conduct a new trial or dismiss the case is January 2015.

However, since reliable Arizonian sources have reported that County Attorney Montgomery is absolutely determined to prosecute Milke until "a judge won't stop him", it seems that the judicial predicaments of Debra Milke won't end very soon.



Former Detective Armando Saldate

The County Attorney of Maricopa County, Bill Montgomery, appealed a ruling by Judge Rosa Mroz which established that former detective Armando Saldate had the right to take the fifth and not to testify in a possible new trial against Milke.

In April, the Arizona Court of Appeals overruled Judge Mroz, ruling that Saldate could be compelled to testify in a retrial of Milke.

Debra Milke (continued)



Debra Milke and mother Renate Janka

It is really mind boggling how the MCAO thinks the testimony of Saldade, a man who has gone so far as to openly state that he could commit a crime if he repeated what he had testified at Milke's first trial, could be deemed credible or reliable by a jury.

Probably, as a supporter has stated, the MCAO want to appear to be "tough on crime" to the majority of the public that has not dug deep in to this case and that may still think she is guilty.

The same source stated that Montgomery may possibly be dragging the proceedings on, hoping that James Styers will change his mind and testify or to try and gather witnesses that will bash Debra Milke.

Concerning Styers, Montgomery's hopes are most probably vain, especially according to those who see in Jim Styers not the real murderer but a man himself wrongfully convicted for murder, while new "reputation witnesses" alleging that Milke somehow wanted to get rid of her son or at least was pissed by him, could not have the same effect they had more than 23 years ago, when Milke was tried by the media before she had been tried in court.

Indeed any non prejudiced prosecutor should realize that evidence against Milke is far below the "beyond a reasonable doubt" bar and dismiss the charge, preventing the waste of more taxpayers' money.

It should be more correctly said that evidence against Milke is simply not existent (innuendos and allegations about her behaviour shouldn't be considered, not even as weak circumstantial evidence) but we know that one cannot pretend too much from prosecutors.

Visit these important links to keep up to date with Debra's case

- [Injustice Anywhere](#)
- [Injustice Anywhere Forum](#)
- [DebbieMilke.com](#)
- [Debra Milke Case Overview by R. Ryder](#)

Jamie Snow



Jamie Snow was wrongfully convicted in 2001 for the 1991 murder of William Little, a gas station attendant in Bloomington, Illinois. Jamie is currently serving a life sentence without the possibility of parole in Stateville prison in Joliet, Illinois.

Jamie Snow has proclaimed his innocence from day one. In the years following his conviction, new information has come to light clearly showing that police misconduct and bad lawyering sent the wrong man to prison for William Little's murder. Jamie Snow is innocent.

1st Annual “Does Innocence Matter?” – McLean County, Illinois

By Tam Alex

On March 14th, we gathered at the McLean County Law & Justice Center to ask for DNA testing in several cold cases...



and this is why...

BACKGROUND

There's something happenin' here.

The commonality is that all of the cases addressed were prosecuted by former state's attorney, now judge, Charles Reynard. This same state's attorney has already had two cases overturned by higher courts, in part, for failing to disclose evidence favorable to the defense.

Alan Beaman has been exonerated. Although he fought his case for years, the state fought DNA testing. His case was actually overturned, in part, because the state failed to disclose an alternative suspect as well as a “test” timeframe test that involved him driving to the crime scene in Bloomington, committing the crime, and driving back to his home in Rockford. It wasn't until after he was set free the state tested the DNA. They found DNA from two unknown suspects. Mr. Beaman spent 12 years behind bars, when they could have found out this information much sooner.

Eric Drew was convicted of murder in a self-defense case. It was proven in an evidentiary hearing the witness (who had since recanted), had been given substantial favors to testify – although these were not revealed to the defense prior to trial.

Jamie Snow (continued)

Which brings us to date. We identified 5 cases prosecuted by the same state's attorney's office – 4 of these cases are based on thin convictions with little or on DNA testing prior to trial: Jamie Snow, Donald Whalen, Barton McNeil, and Michael Carlos. Alternatively, Andrew DuBois has DNA testing that proves his innocence, however it has been ignored. In one of these cases, the state was ordered by the 4th Appellate Court to test physical evidence after a long, unnecessary battle. In another, the state has agreed to some testing, but not all. Despite this stance, current State's Attorney Jason Chamber's says he is proactive in addressing DNA testing.



RALLY

Thirty or so of us gathered outside of the state's attorney's office to ask, "Why Not Test the DNA?" What a wonderful group, and in the freezing cold, we persevered.

Special guest speakers included Alan Mills, Legal Director, Uptown People's Law Center – Chicago, and James Kluppelberg, an Illinois exoneree who spent nearly three decades in prison for a crime he didn't commit.



James Kluppelberg



Alan Mills

Jamie Snow (continued)

We cannot thank Mr. Mills and Mr. Kluppelberg enough for joining us from Chicago to support this cause. They both spoke very eloquently about the issue of overcrowding and innocents in prison.

And there was a stunning speech by Nicole Snow, daughter of wrongfully convicted Jamie Snow. There was not a dry eye during her speech.



Spreading the message through the streets of Bloomington

We thank all of you, who signed the "Out of Towners" board, who were unable to attend, and those of you who braved the cold to come out. Also we'd like to thank those supporters from Injustice Anywhere, Investigating Innocence, The Exoneration Project, Justice for Illinois Wrongfully Convicted, and Whisper Out Loud Radio. We cannot possibly tell you how much your support mean to us.

Media Coverage

WMBD: [Protesters Rally Outside McLean County Courthouse](#)

The Pantagraph: [Rally Urges DNA Testing In Old Cases](#)

Charles Smith Blog: [Bulletin: James Snow: Barton McNeil; Illinois; The Pantagraph reports a rally urging the State's Attorney to move forward with DNA testing in two "old" cases;](#)

Ground Report: [Supporters of the Wrongfully Convicted Ask McLean County State's Attorney Jason Chambers: Does Innocence Matter?](#)

Visit these important links to keep up to date with Jamie's case

- [Injustice Anywhere](#)
- [FreeJamieSnow.com](#)
- [Free Jamie Snow Facebook Page](#)
- [Case overview by Bruce Fischer](#)

Our New Featured Cases

Charles Erickson



We are extremely grateful that Ryan Ferguson is now a free man. Unfortunately, Charles Erickson remains wrongfully convicted, and is currently serving a 25 year prison sentence in Missouri for the murder of Kent Heitholt. Anyone that supports Ryan Ferguson should support the release of Charles Erickson. Charles must not continue to be punished for a murder he did not commit. The Heitholt family deserves justice. The continued incarceration of Charles Erickson brings no justice and no real closure for the family of the victim.

Charles Erickson and Ryan Ferguson were wrongfully convicted in 2005 for the 2001 murder of Columbia Daily Tribune sports editor Kent Heitholt in Missouri. There are no witnesses, no physical evidence, no DNA, no motive, in fact nothing tying either of them to the crime.

Thankfully, Ryan Ferguson was finally freed on November 12, 2013, after serving nearly ten years in prison. Charles Erickson remains wrongfully convicted, and is currently serving a 25 year prison sentence.

It is now blatantly obvious that Charles Erickson had absolutely nothing to do with the murder of Kent Heitholt. This case continues to highlight the terribly flawed Missouri justice system. It is time for the nonsense to end.

Please visit our new website FreeCharlesErickson.org to learn more about this case.

We also encourage everyone to visit the [Free Charles Erickson Facebook](#) page. Charlie's mom, Marianne Erickson, does an outstanding job of providing news and updates on the Facebook page.

Darlie Routier



Darlie Routier was wrongfully convicted in 1997 and sentenced to death in Texas for the 1996 stabbing death of her 5-year-old son Damon. Darlie's 6-year-old son Devon was also murdered during the attack, but prosecutors chose to withhold charges for Devon's murder in case Darlie was acquitted, as there is no statute of limitations for murder in Texas. Evidence shows that Devon and Damon were murdered by an intruder. Darlie Routier is innocent.

Darlie Routier is our newest featured case. Our [forum members](#) did extensive research on this case and recommended the case to our board. Our advocacy efforts are in the early stages with this case. We will be adding more detailed information to our website in the weeks to come.

Websites Supporting Darlie Routier

ForDarlieRoutier.org: Darlie Routier's family has done extensive research on her case and continues to work diligently to provide a wealth of information including court documents and news reports.

DarlieFacts.com: This website is operated by supporters of Darlie Routier. The site is an excellent resource for the case, providing case files, media reports, videos, photos, case summary, and a timeline of events.

Wrongful Conviction News

www.wrongfulconvictionnews.com

In August of 2013, we launched our new website "Wrongful Conviction News." The website is a crowd-sourced media platform. Our mission is to provide a wide range of wrongful conviction news while providing free advertising to help advocates promote the cases they support.

Publish Your Articles

Are you currently advocating for someone that has been wrongfully convicted? Are you currently lobbying to improve the system in order to reduce wrongful convictions? Are you an expert that would like to help educate the public? Are you a past victim of wrongful conviction that would like to tell your story? If you answered yes to any of these questions then Wrongful Conviction News is the right website for you.

You do not need to be a professional writer to contribute to Wrongful Conviction News. If you are credible, passionate, and knowledgeable about your cause, then you have what it takes to write for Wrongful Conviction News.

Wrongful Conviction News is driven by the writers that contribute content. This platform is designed to give you an opportunity to bring more attention to the cases that you advocate for.

Free Advertising

The advertisements you see on Wrongful Conviction News are posted free of charge. Our mission is to bring more attention to wrongful convictions. Wrongful Conviction News wants to help you promote your blog or website. Keep in mind that we will review your website or blog before posting advertisements. In order to qualify for free advertisements, your website or blog will need to be on topic, and free from adult content, violence, and profanity.

If you would like to submit a banner for placement on Wrongful Conviction News, please send your banner image with desired destination link to injusticeanywhere@yahoo.com. Please put "Ad for Wrongful Conviction News" in the subject line of your email.

Recent Articles

- [Italian Judge Slams Amanda Knox Conviction Report](#)
- [Lifetime Movie In Florence, Too: "Amanda Knox and Raffaella Sollecito Stabbed Meredith While Guede Was Holding Her"](#)
- [The Third Murder Trial of David Camm Draws to a Close](#)
- [New Website Exposes Campaign of Lies & Misinformation Against Amanda Knox](#)
- [Freedom For Ryan Ferguson Should Lead To The Release Of His Co-Defendant Charles Erickson](#)
- [Pinocchio Law Keeps Jeffrey Havard on Death Row Despite His Innocence](#)
- [Supporters of the Wrongfully Convicted Ask McLean County State's Attorney Jason Chambers: Does Innocence Matter?](#)



Injustice Anywhere Radio

<http://www.blogtalkradio.com/injustice-anywhere>

The Injustice Anywhere online radio program debuted on August 6, 2013. The show, hosted by Bruce Fischer, welcomes guests that come on to discuss various wrongful conviction cases. Listeners are encouraged to call the show in the to ask questions and offer their comments on the topics being discussed.

We are very pleased with the progress of the show, as our listenership continues to increase with each show. Online radio is definitely new territory for our organization. We will continue to strive to make improvements as we move forward.

You can find information on our upcoming shows posted on the Injustice Anywhere homepage: www.injustice-anywhere.org.



You can listen to past shows anytime by visiting the Injustice Anywhere Radio [archive](#).

Recent Shows



[It's Time For Missouri to Release Ryan Ferguson's Co-Defendant Charles Erickson](#)

Guests: Attorney Laura O'Sullivan and Marianne Erickson



[Innocent On Death Row: A Discussion With Two Death Row Exonerees](#)

Guests: Death row exonerees Sabrina Porter and Derrick Jamison



[Upcoming Event In McLean County Illinois: Does Innocence Matter?](#)

Guests: Tam Alex and Andrew DuBois



[New Expert Evidence Could Lead To New Trial In Jeffrey Havard Death Penalty Case](#)

Guests: Lori Howard and Attorney Jen Fitzgerald



[The Amanda Knox Case: Analyzing The DNA Evidence](#)

Guests: Professor Christopher Halkides, and Molecular Biologist Tom Zupancic



[The Wrongful Conviction Of Jamie Snow](#)

Guests: Tam Alex, Attorney Jen Fitzgerald

Who are we?



Founding Members

Bruce Fischer: Executive Director

Sarah Snyder: Director of Operations

Our Advisory Board



Joseph Bishop: Advocate

Luca Cheli: Author, Advocate, Translator

Doug Matthews: Author, Advocate

Jen Fitzgerald: Attorney, Advocate

Christopher Halkides: Professor of Biochemistry

Ron Hendry: Retired Forensic Engineer

Stu Lyster: Advocate

Philip Mause: Attorney, Advocate

Steve Moore: Retired FBI Agent

Robert Owen: Advocate, Financial Professional

Michael Scadron: Retired Senior Trial Counsel with the United States Department of Justice, Advocate

Nigel Scott: Author, Advocate

Clive Wismayer: English Solicitor, Advocate

Tom Zupancic: Molecular Biologist, Advocate

Please [visit Injustice-Anywhere.org](http://Injustice-Anywhere.org) to learn more about our volunteers. Several of our board members have provided photos and bios.

In addition to the members listed here, Injustice Anywhere also has over 1775 members on our [discussion forum](#) and over 900 members in our [Facebook group](#). We greatly appreciate the efforts of all involved. Several breakthroughs have been discovered by members of our discussion forum that have proven to be beneficial to the cases that we actively support.

Please keep in mind that members of our advisory board do not necessarily agree with every one of our featured cases. Injustice Anywhere understands that many cases are controversial. We welcome the input of our members regardless of personal opinion on guilt or innocence. We believe open dialogue is crucial when working to find the truth.



Rally for Injustice Anywhere

<https://rally.org/injustice-anywhere/donate>

Injustice Anywhere was created to help bring more knowledge and attention to wrongful convictions and to work to bring much needed reform. Injustice Anywhere is an all-volunteer organization. As we move forward with our efforts, we will rely on contributions in order to help cover operational costs.

These costs include: maintaining our websites, obtaining legal documents, legal counsel, insurance, updated media contact data, and promotional materials needed to bring attention to our featured cases.

We have made good progress thanks to the generous donations we have received, but we have a long way to go. In 2013 we asked our supporters to Rally for Injustice Anywhere. Those generous donations made new developments possible, which include: the Wrongful Conviction News website, our new online radio show, the Italian language Injustice in Perugia website, and the Free Charles Erickson website. In addition, we are now registered as an LLC, bringing needed legal protection to our organization.

Please visit Injustice-Anywhere.org today to learn more about supporting our cause. All contributors will receive an Injustice Anywhere wristband and monthly pledges will also receive an Injustice Anywhere t-shirt.



Please only consider making a monetary contribution if you are able to do so. Much of our progress to date has absolutely nothing to do with money. Dedicated individuals that invest their valuable time to advocate for Injustice Anywhere are truly the backbone of our organization. The time and effort put forth by our members is invaluable. Injustice Anywhere greatly appreciates those efforts.