# IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF CRAIGHEAD COUNTY, ARKANSAS WESTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF ARKANSAS

PLAINTIFF

VS. NO.

DAMIEN ECHOLS and JASON BALDWIN

DEFENDANTS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF CLAY COUNTY, ARKANSAS WESTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF ARKANSAS

PLAINTIFF

VS. NO.

JESSIE MISSKELLEY

DEFENDANT

## 

August 19, 2011
\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Came on for hearing before the Honorable David N.

Dianne Gibson, CCR Certified Court Reporter 902 Oriole Drive Jonesboro, AR 72401

(870) 935-1213 (OFFICE/FAX) (870) 219-9049 (CELL)

### **APPEARANCES:**

Scott Ellington Alan Copelin Mike Walden Attorneys at Law Jonesboro, AR 72401

and

Melanie Alsworth West Memphis, AR

For the State

Stephen Braga Attorney at Law Washington, DC 20005-3948

and

Dennis Riordan and Donald Horgan Attorneys at Law San Francisco, CA 94102

and

Laura H. Nirider Attorney at Law Chicago, IL 60611

Patrick Benca Attorney at Law Little Rock, AR 72201

For Defendant Echols

J. Blake Hendrix Attorney at Law Little Rock, AR 72201

and

Erin Cassinelli Attorney at Law

For Defendant Baldwin

## APPEARANCE, cont.

Jeff Rosenzweig Attorney at Law Little Rock, AR 72201

For Defendant Misskelley

1	(COURT REPORTER'S NOTE: Court convened on
2	August 19, 2011, in Jonesboro, Arkansas at 9:30
3	a.m.)
4	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and
5	gentlemen.
6	(Attendees respond.)
7	THE COURT: All right, we are on the record
8	and out of public purview in CR-93-458, State of
9	Arkansas versus Damien Wayne Echols. We're here
10	in CR-93-450, <u>State versus Charles Jason</u>
11	Baldwin. And we're here in Clay Western, 1993-
12	47, State versus Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Jr.
13	All the parties are present and represented
14	by counsel. We have here on behalf of the
15	State, Ms. Melanie Alsworth or Mr. Scott
16	Ellington, the prosecuting attorney for the
17	Second Judicial District. Melanie Alsworth, the
18	deputy prosecutor from Crittenden County, Mike
19	Walden, deputy from Craighead County, and Alan
20	Copelin
21	MR. COPELIN: Right here, Your Honor.
22	Mike's
23	THE COURT: also from Craighead County.
24	We have for Mr. Echols, Dennis Riordan and
25	Donald Horgan from San Francisco, Stephen Braga

1	from Washington, D.C., and Ms. Laura Nirider
2	from Chicago, also on behalf of Echols.
3	Well, Mr. Patrick Binka, are you here,
4	Patrick?
5	MR. BINKA: I am, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Okay, Patrick's here on behalf
7	of Mr. Echols, the local counsel as well.
8	On behalf of Mr. Baldwin, we have Mr. Blake
9	Hendrix and we have Ms. Erin Cassinelli. On
10	behalf of Jessie Misskelley, we have Mr. Jeff
11	Rosensweig. Did that cover everybody?
12	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor. Yes.
13	THE COURT: Okay, good. And, as everyone
14	has known for a couple of days or more, this is
15	a hearing held out of the presence of the
16	public, which we anticipate following by a
17	public hearing at about 11 o'clock, at which
18	time we will proceed to do much of what we're
19	going to talk about here in this private session
20	this session out of the out of the purview
21	of the public. It's on the record with all
22	defendants present.
23	There won't be any rulings made at this
24	hearing. This will be will be a preliminary
25	hearing with such questions and answers as are

necessary in order that everyone understands what is proposed here, what we're about, what the practical ramifications of the proposed Alford plea involve and that sort of thing.

I want to make sure this record will be made public in the event -- in the event there's any sort of challenge directly or indirectly of these proceedings down the line, whether it be by virtue of any -- anything that might be brought against an attorney or brought by either party to set aside any portion of what we are doing.

And, otherwise, it'll simply be for -- for private benefit in order that we -- I want to be very clear on -- what we're doing here is a bit unusual. This case is certainly has attracted a lot of attention, and the rights and obligations of the parties are very, very significant in this case. The victims' family are involved and a divergence of positions in the matter, and defendant families are also involved in these proceedings.

So I want to be as transparent as possible about all this and I want it to -- I want to be certain that this is -- this is -- this is a

procedure that's done because the parties
mutually agree that this is the right thing to
do under the circumstances, and that it's not
subject to any -- any -- any outside influences
or any coercion or threats or anything of that
nature, and that everybody is doing what's
proposed to be doing here because they believe
it's in their best interest to do it.

And, with that, I've introduced the parties and so forth. What the Court understands is that -- I'll give you a general outline of the proceedings the Court understands is going to be followed here in our open hearing in this case.

The Court will be asked, after some preliminary statements are made, to enter a conditional order for a new trial, which will in effect conditionally vacate the sentences that were imposed at the earlier -- earlier trials in the case.

And -- and, will, subject to additional work to be done, grant a new trial in the case, which will revest this Court with jurisdiction to make further proceedings regarding disposition and sentencing, either by virtue of -- of how we handle that.

1	Specifically, in this case it's
2	contemplated that after the conditional order
3	for a new trial, which I assume counsel have
4	been over with their particular clients.
5	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Mr. Echols, I assume you've
7	been over it with your counsel?
8	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
9	THE COURT: And understand the contents of
10	it?
11	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: And Mr. Baldwin?
13	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
15	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: All right, once that is done,
17	we will proceed. It's my understanding that the
18	proposal will be at that point, once that is
19	done, and the Court will determine itself, and I
20	can let you know at this point in time under the
21	circumstances, the Court the Court believes
22	that it is in the best interest of of all
23	involved, and it's consistent with the with
24	the facts to enter a conditional order for a new
25	trial in this case.

I make that decision in conjunction with, but yet independent of, in a sense, of anything that's been done here.

So the -- I commend everyone for working this case the way it's been worked. The information's come in timely and all, and we've gathered -- we've moved a lot of -- of -- we've covered a lot of ground since we had a first hearing in this case and I'm pleased.

Once the order for a new trial is entered, without any further ado, it's my understanding that the -- that a plea proposal has been made in this case would be based on the conditional order for a new trial, that the defendants each wish to accept and the State will -- will make a -- a statement as to certain facts that can be proved by the State in connection with this case upon which a jury, on a new trial, could make a finding of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

And the defendants will not acknowledge or confess guilt to those, however, the defendants will acknowledge that they are aware that that evidence is there, that it will come in, and that under the circumstances they see a -- a real heavy risk involved in proceeding with the

1	trial as opposed to the alternative of entering
2	an agreed disposition as to lesser and
3	alternative sanctions.
4	So far, is everybody on board and
5	understand? Is that what we're about?
6	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Echols?
8	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin?
10	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, sir.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley?
12	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
13	THE COURT: All right, the the bottom
14	line of this is going and that's what's
15	called an <u>Alford</u> plea. It was approved by the
16	United States Supreme Court in in North
17	Carolina v. Alford back a few years ago.
18	It's it's effect is a little bit
19	different from obviously different from the
20	standard guilty plea where a person actually
21	confesses to the and allocutes as to the
22	actual facts charged. And it's a little bit
23	different from a nolo contendere plea, in a
24	sense.

The  $\underline{\text{Alford}}$  plea, I want to make sure

1	everybody's on board. There will be a finding
2	by the Court. Once I find the pleas accepted
3	and everybody's aware of the terms and
4	conditions and it's and it's intelligently
5	entered into, there will be a finding by the
6	Court of guilt on the part of all three
7	defendants to the offense of first-degree
8	murder.
9	MR. ROSENZWEIG: Mr. Misskelley will ask
10	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley will be
11	MR. ROSENZWEIG: first and two seconds.
12	THE COURT: first and two seconds.
13	MR. ROSENZWEIG: That's right.
14	THE COURT: Because that's what his
15	previous trial resolution was.
16	And and that will and it will play as
17	a conviction for for subsequent purposes.
18	In other words, if there is going to be
19	there will be like a period of suspended
20	imposition of sentence. I'm sure all that's
21	been explained. There are certain conditions,
22	there are certain conditions that apply, for
23	instance, to Mr Mr. Misskelley that may not
24	apply to Mr. Echols, Mr. Baldwin. Y'all have
25	been over those individually, I assume, Mr.

1	Echols?
2	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: And Mr. Baldwin?
4	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
6	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: These conditions have to be
8	complied with. The do nots and the do's, and if
9	they're not complied with, then the State can
10	revoke those those suspended impositions, you
11	know, and invoke additional time based on a 40-
12	year maximum, less the amount that's been used
13	up by the sentencing in this case, as far as
14	future offense is concerned.
15	If you should draw a new felony charge,
16	this plea, this <u>Alford</u> plea, will likely be
17	useable against you for enhancement or
18	otherwise.
19	Do each of you understand that, Mr. Echols?
20	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin?
22	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley?
24	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
25	THE COURT: The and the Court will

1	sentence based upon that Allord plea, the
2	Court will sentence each of the defendants to a
3	sentence of the bottom line is time served.
4	There are people from the Department of
5	Corrections here who will have the processing
6	paperwork done here on site, so it will not be
7	necessary you be returned to the ADC to be
8	processed out.
9	That will be done, and you'll be given
10	copies you've signed off, I assume, you've
11	probably signed off on your conditions, have
12	you, Mr. Echols?
13	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin?
15	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley?
17	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
18	THE COURT: And that will be entered
19	those will be entered judgment of commitment
20	orders will be entered, the conditions will be
21	entered. This is a pre '94 case; I don't think
22	it'll be necessary to do a prosecutor's report
23	or a departure report.
24	So that will be it. And and we know
25	from media and otherwise and I'm not telling

1	you defendants anything that you don't know
2	there is a large divergent view out there in the
3	public domain about this case, some more vocal
4	than others, which I suppose is as it should be.
5	It's going to happen anytime you have a matter
6	of this seriousness and with questions and so
7	forth.
8	There's also, I think, a big disconnect
9	between the public purview of a case and the
10	legal system's view of the case, you know. And
11	so that going to be stuff that's going to have
12	to be dealt with, you know, by various people
13	over time and this and that. And actually I may
14	be in a position
15	(Two attorneys enter the courtroom.)
16	THE COURT: This is closed hearing,
17	counsel. Y'all are welcome to come if you can
18	fit into the open hearing, but
19	MALE VOICE: Okay.
20	(Attorneys leave the courtroom.)
21	THE COURT: One of those was Mr. Paul Ford,
22	who formerly represented Mr. Baldwin.
23	And the paperwork should all be done to the
24	point that that everything can be wrapped up
25	here today.

It'll be up to you three, based on your advice of counsel, what you want to do as to what access you will have.

I'll lift a gag order after this proceeding goes through in public hearing, so you'll be free to talk to the extent -- and I would simply caution you to listen closely to your counsel insofar as under what circumstances you talk and how you talk. Your counsel has demonstrated an excellent ability to look out for your interest in this case, and I think they bear listening to in that regard.

We'll also have an opportunity that counsel, if counsel wishes to speak with the media, they'll be able to. And that counsel will be for the State and for the -- and for the defense.

The -- the -- Mr. Echols, the way it -this is a for instance, the recommendation to
your case, Mr. Echols, is 216 months and 78
days, 18 years and 78 days, imprisonment in the
Department of Correction with credit for 216
months and 78 days, with a period of suspended
imposition of sentence additionally for a period
of 120 months, with the same as to B and C, the

1	other two.
2	MR. ECHOLS: Right.
3	THE COURT: So that will be three
4	concurrent dispositions in that regard. And
5	and I assume it's the same as to the other
6	actions, as to Mr. Baldwin and Misskelley.
7	In your case, Mr. Echols, if if your
8	suspension is revoked for violation, we may
9	impose upon you a sentence of up to 252 months
10	and 287 days, 21 years and 287 days in the
11	Department of Corrections. Do you understand
12	that?
13	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: And what are the numbers on Mr.
15	Baldwin?
16	MR. WALDEN: Judge, I I you may be
17	working from old first drafts.
18	THE COURT: I'm working from what?
19	MR. WALDEN: I've got the I've got the
20	final drafts here, and then there's one on each
21	defendant, and you can go from those. I would
22	point out, on Echols and Baldwin, we just added
23	the 120 SIS on on one count, so we wouldn't
24	have this concurrent, consecutive
25	THE COURT: All right.

1	MR. WALDEN: so it's that makes it
2	clear that it's 122
3	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin 216 months, 78
4	days, with credit for 216 months and 78 days as
5	to the three counts, but the suspended
6	imposition on one count of 120 months.
7	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: And and in in your case,
9	you would be liable for 252 months and 287 days
10	in the event of a revocation of your suspended
11	imposition. Do you understand that?
12	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: And I believe that would be the
14	same with Mr. Echols.
15	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: And I don't have or Mr.
17	Misskelley's, let me see his materials. I've
18	tried to stay up to speed on this, but Mr.
19	Misskelley, yours would be
20	MR. WALDEN: Same
21	THE COURT: 216 months and 78 days, with
22	credit for full credit for that, and 120
23	months suspended imposition on one count.
24	The and in in the event and you
25	would be liable for an additional 252 months and

1	287 days, or 21 years and 287 days in the ADC
2	for a violation or revocation. Do you
3	understand that?
4	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Those are the numbers I
6	wanted to make sure everybody's clear about.
7	So the understanding is here, you have
8	you have all executed a Mr. Echols, you've
9	executed a guilty plea statement pursuant to
10	Alford in this case?
11	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: Is that correct?
13	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: That's been over by you with
15	your attorneys and fully explain to you and you
16	had your questions answered and signed off on
17	it?
18	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: And the same with you, Mr.
20	Baldwin?
21	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: You've been over yours and
23	signed off on it?
24	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?

1	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Now, at this point in
3	time, does counsel for either the State or the
4	defendants have additional questions you wish to
5	bring up at this hearing in order to make sure
6	there are no unanswered questions? Mr.
7	Rosenzweig.
8	MR. ROSENZWEIG: A venue issue, and we
9	would formally waive venue because Mr.
10	Misskelley is a
11	THE COURT: As to the
12	MR. ROSENZWEIG: Clay County
13	THE COURT: Clay County venue.
14	MR. ROSENZWEIG: Yes, sir. And so we
15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
16	MR. ROSENZWEIG: would waive for
17	waive venue.
18	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. It's so
19	ordered.
20	MS. ALSWORTH: May I ask for some direction
21	from the Court, please, if that's okay?
22	THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.
23	MS. ALSWORTH: I'm I'm looking at
24	some
25	THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

1	THE COURT: Melanie.
2	MS. ALSWORTH: Sir?
3	THE COURT: She's not hearing you. Do we
4	not have a we don't have a podium? Don't
5	have room for a podium.
6	MR. ROSENSWEIG: Right there. Right there.
7	Right there in front of you.
8	THE COURT: Here's one right here.
9	MS. ALSWORTH: Yes, sir. Regarding the
10	statement of facts that will be presented this
11	morning, I believe that we've agreed on a rather
12	diluted statement, and I understand the reason
13	for doing that, the sensitive nature of the
14	case.
15	I would just ask for an opportunity this
16	morning while we're in this in-chambers meeting
17	to provide additional facts that the Court could
18	incorporate to find that there is a factual
19	basis for the pleas.
20	THE COURT: All right. All right.
21	MR. HENDRIX: Your Honor, we have an agreed
22	and I hope you've had an opportunity to see
23	the agreed factual basis for the pleas.
24	THE COURT: Well, the only one that I've
25	seen is the is the long form.

1	THE COURT REPORTER: Could I have a name,
2	please?
3	MR. HENDRIX: Blake.
4	THE COURT: Blake Hendrix.
5	MR. HENDRIX: Your Honor
6	THE COURT: You represent
7	MS. ALSWORTH: That's my copy, Your Honor,
8	so
9	THE COURT: Baldwin. Is this the
10	MR. HENDRIX: That that's it, Your
11	Honor. That's the agreed factual basis for
12	the
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	MR. HENDRIX: plea to be read in open
15	court, and we hope Your Honor will read through
16	it and concur that it's sufficient in order to
17	make this legally binding.
18	THE COURT: Well, I I said I want to
19	make sure that it is and but I don't have any
20	objection if Ms. Alsworth wishes to at this
21	hearing, if she wishes to introduce an expanded
22	version of the factual scenario that'll be
23	accepted. You can either do it in written form
24	or you can read it, however you want to do it.
25	MS. ALSWORTH: I would just like to provide

1	some additional facts and I can do it verbally.
2	<pre>I don't have anything</pre>
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MS. ALSWORTH: written that I could
5	submit to the Court.
6	MR. HENDRIX: And, Your Honor, just with
7	that caveat that very likely there may be things
8	said that that we dispute. We do not want to
9	get in the way of of this proceeding going
10	forward.
11	THE COURT: Well, this proceeding doesn't
12	really doesn't really the defendants don't
13	don't stipulate to the truth of any of the
14	matters, as I understand it. Simply that they
15	are matters that would be in evidence, if the
16	case went forward. Is that correct?
17	MR. HENDRIX: That's correct, Your Honor.
18	The long and short of it is, the document that
19	you have in front of us that was to be read in
20	open court is what we specifically agreed
21	establishes the
22	THE COURT: You're saying the rest of it
23	has some contested facts in it?
24	MR. HENDRIX: Very likely.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor, Stephen Braga for Mr. Echols. Just getting onto that, it's a little unusual case because there's already been a trial and a conviction affirmed by the Arkansas Supreme Court, so the factual basis isn't sort of we don't know anything about what it is, what does the government have, what are they going to show.

The brief statement before, Your Honor, we think, in -- in conjunction with the Arkansas Supreme Court's decision on the direct appeals makes it abundantly clear that there's sufficient evidence on which the defendants could be convicted; they were convicted.

So I think the basis for an  $\underline{\text{Alford}}$  plea is there. I -- I would just worry about going too much into controverted facts for the reasons stated by Mr. Hendrix.

THE COURT: Well, I'm doing it in the open session, but I'm talking about doing it in this session and I'll tell you that my position -- and I'm thinking out loud -- we're -- we're taking a further step that's been taken. We're -- we're doing a conditional new trial in this case, which puts us back at square one.

1	MR. BRAGA: Right.
2	THE COURT: And we don't assume anything at
3	that point in time. And the factual basis has
4	to be laid in order to justify the plea that's
5	being proposed, even an <u>Alford</u> plea. So so
6	I'm going to permit in. I will I will permit
7	you to add, amplify the additional factors in
8	the Chambers discussion.
9	Ms. Alsworth, you want to do that now?
10	MS. ALSWORTH: Thank you, Your Honor,
11	whenever
12	THE COURT: All right.
13	MS. ALSWORTH: the Court's ready.
14	THE COURT: All right, and and counsel
15	of the three and Mr Mr. Echols, Mr.
16	Baldwin, Mr. Misskelley, all saying this
17	abbreviated version?
18	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: And I assume they've all been
20	over the expanded version as well?
21	MR. BRAGA: We we are aware of what the
22	
23	THE COURT: You're aware
24	MR. BRAGA: expanded
25	THE COURT: of it and

1	MR. BRAGA: Yes.
2	THE COURT: have talked about it?
3	MS. ALSWORTH: And I don't plan to read the
4	entire thing. I think that there is a paragraph
5	in there that says that there is substantial
6	direct and circumstantial evidence in the record
7	that supports the guilty pleas, and I would just
8	like to briefly go over some of
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MS. ALSWORTH: the facts and
11	THE COURT: Go ahead.
12	MS. ALSWORTH: the Court can make
13	findings.
14	Your Honor, as far as the circumstantial
15	evidence is concerned, the autopsy reports on
16	the victims showed that there were many injuries
17	that were consistent with multiple weapons being
18	used. One was a sharp object, such as a knife.
19	One weapon was consistent with the size of a
20	broom handle. One weapon was large and blunt.
21	Additional observations were the knots that
22	were used to bind the victims. The knots were
23	of three different types, indicating that more
24	than one person was involved.
25	Your Honor, I believe that there was

evidence collected in the form of fibers from some of the victims' clothing at the scene that was subsequently compared to fibers taken from two of the defendants' homes that were microscopically similar to the fibers collected from the victims' clothing.

Also, Your Honor, there was a knife that was found in the lake behind Mr. Baldwin's residence. This knife was a survival-type knife. Believe that the testimony could possibly establish that the pattern of the knife was consistent with some of the injuries on the victims. Testimony from the State would establish that Mr. Echols was known to carry a knife very similar to this, with the only exception on the end of his knife was a compass that was not present on the knife that was recovered from the lake.

Your Honor, as far as the direct evidence is concerned, would point the Court to the statements that the State would introduce that were allegedly made by Mr. Echols, admitting his involvement in this case, which was overheard by girls at a softball game.

Regarding Mr. Baldwin, he allegedly made a

statement while he was in juvenile detention to 1 2 another detainee in Craighead County. 3 And with Mr. Misskelley, he made statements to law enforcement officers after he was 4 Mirandized, implicating himself in these crimes. 5 The facts from Mr. Misskelley's statement and 6 7 what we allege Mr. Baldwin's statement to be are consistent with the actual evidence in the case 8 9 and we'd ask you to consider those as well. 10 THE COURT: All right. And counsel and 11 defendants in the case, you understand that that evidence is out there, that the State purports 12 13 to introduce it and make the argument based upon 14 it connecting you with this offence. You 15 understand that? 16 MR. ECHOLS: Yes, Your Honor. 17 MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Even though you don't agree with it? 19 20 MR. ECHOLS: Yes, Your Honor. 21 MR. HENDRIX: And, Your Honor, in response, 22 again, we agree that there is a sufficient 23 factual basis for this Alford plea and not to 24 atomize too much what has just been said, but to

show that I know Your Honor is granting our DNA

1	petitions and, in the conditional order, finding
2	that there has been presented to you clear and
3	convincing evidence that a reasonable fact
4	finder could acquit these gentlemen. And
5	THE COURT: I think they use the term
6	compelling, perhaps.
7	MR. HENDRIX: That's correct, Your Honor.
8	MR. BRAGA: That's correct, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: I think they used the term
10	compelling
11	MR. HENDRIX: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: and and the Court's job
13	is to determine whether whether a new jury
14	hearing the same situation that was heard before
15	plus everything that's come in since then, would
16	likely reach a different result
17	MR. HENDRIX: Yes, sir, that would
18	THE COURT: than was reached before.
19	MR. HENDRIX: And largely, Your Honor, that
20	was based on now scientific evidence that has
21	shown that the knife in question was very likely
22	not, in fact, a murder weapon, but that the
23	wounds that have been referenced were actually
24	caused by animal predation.
25	THE COURT: Well, I'm I'm aware of

1 those, yeah, of those arguments.

MR. HENDRIX: Okay.

THE COURT: The -- while we're on that point, the Court has not yet ruled -- did not rule. Three things come to mind and I'm sure counsels' been over these with the -- the defendants.

One was the -- the jury misconduct issue -- the juror misconduct issue that related to the jury foreperson in the Craighead County trial with Mr. Echols had not been ruled on at this point.

And the -- another one was the -- was to what extent the -- the DNA that -- obviously the DNA that was already in in front of the Supreme Court, you know, stays in and is, I think, is probably the most compelling DNA that's been received to this point, you know, following the subsequent, you know.

The further and further removed we get from the locus in the case, you know, the negative findings mean perhaps less. But in any event, also I haven't ruled on that, although my -- my view is to let whatever DNA is out there come in, certainly at the evidentiary hearing before

1 me.

The Supreme Court also authorized me to do whatever the Court felt was appropriate insofar as how to handle Mr. Misskelly's statement that was used against him at his own trial, as to how it might be used against the other two defendants in the case. And the Court has not made a ruling on that. The Supreme Court even indicated I could do it by affidavit or I could do it by -- by the statements themselves or otherwise.

And I haven't -- I'm not exactly sure, following it all the way through, whether or not how I handle it at the evidentiary hearing would be necessarily binding on how we handle it at the -- at a new trial when a new trial was granted, you know.

But I'll simply say along those lines that it's -- and I don't think I'm telling counsel for either side anything that y'all don't already know, that I believe that in matters of that -- that importance, the right to cross examine is very important. And the Court's inclination is to preserve the right to cross examine without regard to the latitude given to

1	me in the Supreme Court decision.
2	I just believe that, well, that's a basic
3	fundamental fundamental right.
4	So those issues, and I don't think I
5	can't recall any other issues that were not
6	really touched on by the Court, can counsel?
7	MR. BRAGA: No, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Now, and so far so
9	far, Mr. Echols, are you up to speed on what
10	we've talked
11	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: about here? And you, Mr.
13	Baldwin?
14	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
16	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: Okay, are there any other
18	does counsel have any other questions about the
19	proceedings?
20	MR. BRAGA: None for Mr. Echols, Your
21	Honor.
22	MR. COPELIN: One one thing, Judge, is
23	the Court commonly, when you take a plea,
24	advised that the defendants have accepted the
25	plea offer, but in this case, actually the

1	defendants proposed the <u>Alford</u> plea offer and
2	the State accepted it.
3	If that's that's the facts and that's
4	the the position that we take, so I don't
5	know if that
6	THE COURT: I'll simply state the plea
7	agreement has been reached.
8	MR. COPELIN: That's fine. Thank you.
9	THE COURT: I don't really care which way
10	it started or which way it's emanated from or
11	to, but that a plea agreement has been reached.
12	MR. ELLINGTON: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Echols, do you have any
14	questions you wish to ask your counsel or the
15	Court at this point about these proceedings?
16	MR. ECHOLS: None that I can think of right
17	now, sir.
18	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Baldwin?
19	MR. BALDWIN: No, sir, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley?
21	MR. MISSKELLEY: No, sir.
22	MR. COPELIN: And one other thing, are you
23	going to ask are we going to hear how each of
24	the defendants plan to respond to you here in
25	Chambers as far as how they plea, so that

1	that we can so that you can know how, you
2	know, the wording that the
3	THE COURT: Let me hear from counsel first.
4	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Braga.
6	MR. BRAGA: Consistent with our discussion
7	yesterday, Mr. Echols will say at the
8	appropriate point, Your Honor, I am innocent of
9	these charges, but I am entering a guilty plea
10	pursuant to <u>Alford</u> based on my counsels' advice
11	in light of the fact that I've determined it's
12	in my best interest based on the entire record.
13	THE COURT: You're prepared to do that, Mr.
14	Echols?
15	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: And Mr. Baldwin?
17	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Same for you?
19	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
21	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
22	THE COURT: Okay, does counsel wish to make
23	a statement and let the and let them agree
24	with it from the standpoint of wording?
25	MR. BRAGA: That would probably be easier,

Your Honor. I did want to make a brief 1 2 statement about sort of why I think an Alford 3 plea is appropriate for the record, but --THE COURT: State it. 4 MR. BRAGA: -- it would be very brief. 5 THE COURT: Go ahead and state it, if you 6 7 want to now. MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor. This -- this 8 9 obviously, as you said, there's a large 10 divergence of opinion on this case. It's been a 11 war for 18 years. 12 The Alford plea is a unique kind of plea, 13 rarely used, but there specifically for the best 14 interest of the defendant, the interest of justice and judicial efficiency when you have 15 16 this kind of war. How do we stop this war? 17 They're forced to fight for 18 more years. 18 Alford plea says no. The defendants get to 19 maintain their innocence, the prosecution gets a quilty plea, finality is reached. 20 21 The -- the requirement of Alford, adopted 22 by the Supreme Court in North Carolina v. Alford 23 that Your Honor cited, is it's got to be in the best interest of the defendant. So what's the 24

trigger for that? That he could be convicted,

1	that there is some evidence out there that could
2	convict him.
3	In Mr. Echols case, the the softball
4	girls referenced by Ms. Alsworth, if their
5	testimony alone were accepted by a jury and the
6	jury didn't pay attention to anything else, that
7	would be sufficient to convict him; he
8	understands that.
9	He's on death row. This deal allows him to
10	get off of death row. That's Alford. And
11	Alford is not
12	THE COURT: The stakes are very high
13	MR. WHATEVER: pled
14	THE COURT: in other words.
15	MR. WHATEVER: to avoid the death
16	penalty. So the <u>Alford</u> plea is particularly
17	appropriate in this case for Mr. Echols, we
18	would say, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Hendrix.
20	MR. HENDRIX: Your Honor, what I would
21	simply propose is, is if I said Mr. Baldwin was
22	pleading guilty pursuant to North Carolina v.
23	Alford and Arkansas Rules of Criminal Procedure,
24	Rule 24.
25	THE COURT: And he will agree with that?

1	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right, and
3	MR. ROSENZWEIG: And
4	THE COURT: Mr. Rosenzweig.
5	MR. ROSENZWEIG: and I'll probably
6	say I'll do something similar, Your Honor,
7	and Mr. Misskelley will will agree.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. COPELIN: So you're the defendants
10	are actually not going to say I'm pleading
11	guilty pursuant to <u>Alford</u> .
12	THE COURT: They're pleading guilty
13	pursuant to <u>Alford</u> in North Carolina versus
14	Alford.
15	MR. COPELIN: But it's not coming out of
16	their mouth, it's coming out of
17	THE COURT: It's going to
18	MR. COPELIN: counsels' mouth.
19	THE COURT: come out of counsels' mouth
20	and then they're going to agree that that is
21	their plea.
22	MR. COPELIN: I thought that when we talked
23	earlier you were going to that
24	THE COURT: I mean they will state that is
25	their plea. I think the wording is is

1	important, though.
2	MR. COPELIN: And
3	THE COURT: And I'm not wanting it unless
4	we have to have each of the defendants try to
5	wing it separately.
6	MR. COPELIN: But the Court actually asked
7	counsel in a brief just a conference
8	yesterday if they were going to pen something
9	for their so that their clients could read it
10	aloud during you asked if they were going to
11	compose something for them to to
12	THE COURT: And I don't think they said
13	they they were. They said they could work it
14	out, something of that nature and that's what
15	we're doing here sort of.
16	MR. COPELIN: Well, and that's what I'm
17	asking you if I mean, I I would the
18	State would prefer to hear it come from the
19	defendants' mouth if if they have to write it
20	on a post-it card and let them read it, that
21	that it comes out of their mouth that I am
22	pleading guilty pursuant to North Carolina v.
23	Alford. That that's what I've told the
24	victims' families because that was my
25	understanding originally that was going to be

Τ	sald.
2	And so that's why I'm I'm just if I
3	hadn't told the victims' families that, and I'm
4	not trying to be
5	THE COURT: Well, what I'm going to do is
6	ask counsel to say that I'm going to ask the
7	defendants themselves if they are in fact
8	pleading guilty under North Carolina v. Alford
9	because they believe it's in their best interest
10	to do so, all things considered in this case.
11	And they will answer me yes.
12	MR. COPELIN: Understand. I I
13	THE COURT: Doesn't that accomplish what
14	you're talking about?
15	MR. COPELIN: I wanted the words I
16	wanted to hear the words coming out of their
17	mouth: I plead guilty pursuant to or
18	pursuant to U.S North Carolina v. Alford, I
19	plead guilty.
20	And and that's what I wanted to hear,
21	but the Court
22	THE COURT: All right, if you want to write
23	something down for them to say, that's fine.
24	MR. RIORDAN: Whatever way Your Honor wants
25	to

1	THE COURT: Go ahead
2	MR. RIORDAN: do it. We
3	THE COURT: and do that
4	MR. RIORDAN: have written it down
5	THE COURT: Mr. Braga
6	MR. RIORDAN: for Mr. Echols.
7	THE COURT: to satisfy the State.
8	MR. COPELIN: Thank you.
9	THE COURT: And and counsel, just, you
10	know, if it wants to come out that way, fine.
11	We we'll short circuit the process that way.
12	MR. HENDRIX: And and, Your Honor, as
13	agreed upon wording that I'm going to write for
14	my client, I'm going to write that I, Jason
15	Baldwin, plead guilty pursuant to North Carolina
16	v. Alford and Rule 24 of the Arkansas Rules of
17	Criminal Procedure, and I believe I am innocent.
18	MR. COPELIN: That's fine.
19	THE COURT: That's fine.
20	MR. COPELIN: That that's I just
21	wanted to hear it because that's what I told the
22	victims' families.
23	MR. HENDRIX: Although I believe myself to
24	be innocent of the charges.

THE COURT: Okay, fine. And each of you do

Ţ	that sort of thing, I don't think we'll have a
2	problem at all.
3	MR. HENDRIX: Very good, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Okay. All right, anything
5	else, counsel?
6	MR. BRAGA: Nothing from Mr. Echols, Your
7	Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right, we've got about 20
9	minutes before we open the matter up.
10	MS. ALSWORTH: You have my statement.
11	THE COURT: I do?
12	MS. ALSWORTH: Yes, sir.
13	THE COURT: This one?
14	MS. ALSWORTH: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS. ALSWORTH: Thank you.
17	MR. COPELIN: And to make it clear,
18	Melanie's not going to read the this added
19	facts when the public gets here.
20	THE COURT: This is correct. She'll read
21	the short form that's
22	MR. COPELIN: Right.
23	THE COURT: that's been agreed on
24	between counsel.

MR. HENDRIX: All right, Thank you.

1	THE COURT: All right, we'll reconvene here
2	at 11:00.
3	Yes, Sheriff?
4	THE SHERIFF: Your Honor, Mr. Byers has
5	been out in front of the courthouse, ex-
6	tremely
7	THE COURT: Byers?
8	THE SHERIFF: Yes, sir extremely vocal
9	and extremely hostile and has made some threats.
10	THE COURT: Well
11	THE SHERIFF: So I don't know what his
12	actions are going to be in hearing.
13	THE COURT: Well, if he's if he appears
14	to be a security risk at any point in time, or a
15	disruptive risk at any point in time, I have no
16	problem with him being kept out of the hearing.
17	MR. COPELIN: Mr. Branch as well.
18	THE COURT: Huh?
19	MR. COPELIN: And Mr. Branch as well. He's
20	the one that went over
21	THE COURT: Branch is the one that was on
22	the I understand that. But, no, I do not
23	want any I want to err on the side of
24	security. All these, Mr. Echols, Mr. Baldwin,
25	and Mr. Misskellev are in our protective custody

1	at this point, and I want everybody protected
2	and even if it means I mean, I I don't
3	want to be in the business of excluding victim
4	family from the public proceedings, but by the
5	same token if the risks the security impact
6	outweigh the benefits of them being here, then
7	they are to be kept out.
8	I'm going to leave that in your discretion.
9	THE SHERIFF: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Then they can watch it on
11	they can watch it on the feed that we're going
12	to have.
13	Okay, we're adjourned. We'll be back in
14	session at 11:00.
15	(Court stood adjourned briefly at 10:48
16	a.m.)
17	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and
18	gentlemen. Be seated please, those of you who
19	can.
20	All right, I'm David Laser, Circuit Judge,
21	Division Nine, the Second Judicial District of
22	the state of Arkansas, which includes both
23	Craighead and the Western District of Clay
24	County, Arkansas, as well as seven other
25	courthouses in single or split districts in this

1	district.
2	We're on the record in the cases of State
3	of Arkansas versus Damien Echols, Charles Jason
4	Baldwin, Craighead CR-93-450 and 458. And we're
5	also here on Clay Western, CR-93-147, Jessie
6	Lloyd Misskelley, Jr.
7	The Court notes that that all three
8	defendants are present and were also present at
9	a preliminary closed-session hearing that was
10	just conducted with no affirmative action being
11	taken. It was simply in order to make sure that
12	everybody was completely informed and onboard as
13	to what has been proposed to the Court by the
14	parties in this case.
15	Counsel have been previously identified and
16	we have on behalf of Mr. Echols, Mr. Dennis
17	Riordan, Mr. Donald Horgan, Mr. Stephen Braga,
18	Ms. Laura H. Nirider and Mr. Patrick Benca.
19	We have counsel on behalf of Mr. Baldwin
20	Mr. Blake Hendrix and Ms. Erin Cassinelli.
21	And we have counsel on behalf of Mr.
22	Misskelley Mr. Jeff Rosenzweig.
23	The State is represented in this case by
24	Mr. Scott Ellington, prosecutor for the Second

Judicial District, and deputy prosecutors

Melanie Alsworth, Michael Walden, and Alan Copelin.

As indicated, subject to the Court's approval, certain dispositive agreements have been reached by and between the State and the defendants in this case to bring a resolution to the issues in this case. I have been presented for review a conditional order for a new trial in this case, which if approved by the Court would, in order to reinvest this Court in the jurisdiction of this matter in order that this Court might be in full power to do whatever is necessary to be done to implement the -- the plea agreement and to enter final judgments and commitments in this case, would have to be approved subject to additional steps to be taken, upon which that is a condition.

The conditional order for a new trial is -- is one that's presented by agreement of the parties.

Mr. Walden, tell me the State's position as relates to the proposed continued conditional order.

MR. WALDEN: Your Honor, as the Court indicated, you should have two orders in front

1	of you that were agreed to by the parties all
2	the parties for the defendants and the State.
3	One is in the Clay County case involving Mr.
4	Misskelley. The other's in the Craighead
5	County case
6	THE COURT: Speak up a little bit or either
7	move forward toward the reporter, please.
8	MR. WALDEN: The other is in the Craighead
9	County case involving Mr. Echols and Mr.
10	Baldwin. Each of these are titled order of
11	conditional order granting new conditional
12	order of new trial.
13	It's an effort by the parties, really, in
14	response to recent overtures by the defense to
15	bring this matter to a resolution.
16	And if the conditions as set forth in those
17	orders are met, then the State is agreeable to
18	the dispositions that that are contemplated
19	by those orders.
20	I think that if the Court wants me to
21	summarize them, essentially we're asking the
22	Court to to grant these grant the in
23	accordance with the jurisdiction that you've
24	assumed, go ahead and grant the new trials,
25	making the findings necessary to grant those new

trials or recognizing that this granting of a new trial is on the condition that -- or is on the condition that certain other conditions are met after that, and those would be the entry of the pleas that are contemplated by the parties.

I believe it contemplates entries by Mr. Echols and Mr. Baldwin to three guilty pleas pursuant to <u>Alford versus North Carolina</u>, and everyone, I think, is aware that that's the method by which someone can enter a plea of guilty and still maintain innocence.

Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Echols would enter the pleas to the three counts of murder. Mr. Misskelley, in accordance with -- more in line with his jury verdict from Clay County, would enter a plea to one first-degree murder count, two second-degree murder counts on the first-degree murder count. He would get the same sentence as the others.

Each of them involves a sentence to essentially -- the Court has the numbers in front of him. They are -- they are timed-served sentences that would be followed by an additional period of suspended imposition of sentence that would last for 10 years from this

1	date.
2	That has certain conditions, obviously the
3	most significant of which to, you know, be of
4	law-abiding character and not violate the laws
5	of the State of Arkansas or any other state.
6	The State's position is that we're
7	agreeable to a new trial being granted for that
8	sole purpose.
9	THE COURT: The State acknowledges for the
10	basis proposed to the Court as a conditional new
11	trial, that there is a basis for the Court to
12	grant a new trial
13	MR. WALDEN: We
14	THE COURT: in this case.
15	MR. WALDEN: we acknowledge that the
16	Court, based on the record before it, could make
17	that finding.
18	And and based on that we are entering
19	into this agreement, but again, for the sole
20	purpose of allowing the pleas to take place with
21	the understanding that if the pleas don't take
22	place, the Court would rescind its order of a
23	new trial, and that would be revoked and we will

be back on the track that we've been for the

last several years, heading toward a new

24

1	trial
2	THE COURT: We'd proceed to gather evidence
3	and have an evidentiary hearing on December 5th
4	as scheduled, towards the end of the Court
5	making a ruling as to whether or not it
6	recommends a new trial in the case.
7	MR. WALDEN: Is that sufficient
8	THE COURT: I think so.
9	MR. WALDEN: for the State?
10	THE COURT: I want to hear from the
11	defense. Someone on behalf of Mr. Braga?
12	MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor, on behalf of
13	Mr. Echols. Mr. Walden has accurately
14	summarized the understanding between the
15	parties. Mr. Echols has been advised about it.
16	We're agreeable to the conditional order for a
17	new trial to implement the other two steps of
18	the recommendation, the $\underline{\text{Alford}}$ plea and the
19	sentence, which I understand we'll discuss a
20	little more in detail later.
21	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Hendrix.
22	MR. HENDRIX: And, Your Honor, I echo the
23	words of Mr. Braga and Mr. Walden. This is a
24	fair summary of the agreement that's been
25	reached between the parties in the ultimate

1	resolution of the case. Thank you.
2	MR. ROSENZWEIG: And Mr. Misskelley is in
3	concurrence with everyone else.
4	THE COURT: Okay, and, Mr. Echols, you
5	heard what your counsel has said. You're in
6	agreement with that?
7	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
8	THE COURT: And Mr. Baldwin?
9	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
11	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Thank you. The Court having
13	received evidence since we had our initial
14	scheduling in this case and hearing the proposal
15	of the parties, believes that there is a basis
16	in this case for its ordering a new trial,
17	conditional on the fulfillment of certain other
18	requirements of this proposed <u>Alford</u> plea. And
19	the Court will enter a conditional order for a
20	new trial at this time on behalf of both Mr.
21	Echols, Mr. Baldwin, and Mr. Misskelley.
22	MR. BRAGA: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: It's my understanding now as
24	relates to the and an order will be entered
25	to that effect.

Now that we're at the state where the Court 1 2 has entered an order of a new trial in the case, 3 before we proceed on with the -- with the plea in the case, counsel -- does the State wish to 4 make -- does the State have a recommendation or 5 wish to modify the charges in this case before 6 7 we proceed to sentencing and guilty plea? 8 MR. COPELIN: Your Honor, yes. You have 9 the paperwork there in your hands. The State 10 will so move to amend the charges we previously 11 filed to those reflecting first-degree murders, three counts, for Mr. Echols; first-degree 12 murder for three counts for Mr. Baldwin; one 13 14 first-degree murder and two second-degree 15 murders for Mr. Misskelley, commensurate with 16 the negotiated plea that you have with you. 17 THE COURT: All right. All right, the 18 Court will so note and the charges will be 19 modified accordingly. 20 The -- at this point in time I want to 21 proceed with the -- with the Alford plea. 22 If you would, please, Mr. -- Mr. Echols, 23 Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Misskelley, if you would stand, 24 please, and face the Court and speak up loudly

enough that you can be heard.

1	You are Damien Echols?
2	MR. ECHOLS: That's correct.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Echols, how old are you?
4	MR. ECHOLS: I am 36 years old.
5	THE COURT: How much education and
6	schooling do you have?
7	MR. ECHOLS: Ninth grade high school,
8	completed a GED after that.
9	THE COURT: All right, are you under the
10	influence of any drugs, alcohol, medication, or
11	substance?
12	MR. ECHOLS: None at all.
13	THE COURT: And, Mr. Baldwin, how old are
14	you?
15	MR. BALDWIN: I'm 33, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: How much education or schooling
17	do you have?
18	MR. BALDWIN: Completed seventh grade, I've
19	earned my diploma through GED, and I have 30
20	plus hours of college.
21	THE COURT: Are you under the influence of
22	any drugs, alcohol, medication, or substance?
23	MR. BALDWIN: No, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Misskelley, how old are
25	you, sir?

1	MR. MISSKELLEY: Thirty-six.
2	THE COURT: How much education or schooling
3	do you have?
4	MR. MISSKELLEY: The ninth grade, sir.
5	THE COURT: Ninth grade?
6	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: Do do you read and write and
8	understand English?
9	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
10	THE COURT: Have you been over all the
11	paperwork with your counsel, had your questions
12	answered, and had things read to you that you
13	could not read for yourself and fully understand
14	what's going on here?
15	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir, I do.
16	THE COURT: All right, are you under the
17	influence of any drugs, alcohol, medication, or
18	substance?
19	MR. MISSKELLEY: No, sir.
20	THE COURT: Okay, for the three of you here
21	on charges Mr. Echols, Mr. Baldwin, you're
22	here on charges of three counts of first-degree
23	murder as opposed to capital murder.
24	And Mr. Misskelley, you're here on the
25	charge of first-degree murder and two counts of

1	second-degree murder. Do you understand that?
2	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Do each of you understand that
4	that you do not have to plead guilty in any
5	form or fashion to any of these charges, but
6	have a right to go further and go fully to have
7	the Court proceed to rule as to whether or not
8	you're entitled to a new trial?
9	And if you be determined to be entitled to
10	a new trial, to fully challenge the proceedings
11	through trial, a new trial, through verdict and,
12	if adverse to you, on appeal.
13	Do you understand that, Mr. Echols?
14	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr.
16	Baldwin?
17	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: And you understand that, Mr.
19	Misskelley?
20	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: And do you understand that
22	during those proceedings you would all have, as
23	you have in the past, you all have full you'd
24	have a right to be fully and completely
25	represented by counsel at all stages of the

1	proceeding, whether it be for a determination of
2	motions, whether it be determination of trial,
3	whether it be subpoenaing witnesses, whether it
4	be cross-examining State's witnesses as to
5	whether or not to to testify, and as to all
6	your rights and obligations in the proceedings.
7	Do you understand that, Mr. Echols?
8	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr.
10	Baldwin?
11	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
13	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Do you further understand that
15	if you proceed forward with this plea, this
16	Alford guilty plea, and it is accepted by the
17	Court, each of you will have waived and given up
18	your right for the Court to to go to jury
19	trial in this case? And you will have waived
20	any right to appeal from any sentence that's
21	imposed here today.
22	Do you understand that Mr. Echols?
23	MR. ECHOLS: I do understand that.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin?
25	MR. BALDWIN: I do, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: And Mr. Misskelley?
2	MR. MISSKELLEY: I do understand, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE COURT: Knowing all this at this point
5	in time and does counsel does counsel
6	agree so far that the proceedings in this case
7	are in the best interest of the of the
8	defendants, Mr. Braga?
9	MR. BRAGA: Yes, we do, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: And Mr. Hendrix?
11	MR. HENDRIX: I do, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And Mr. Rosenzweig?
13	MR. ROSENZWEIG: I do also, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: At this point in time I would
15	like to ask the the State to to read a
16	statement of agreed information that is going to
17	be offered that would be offered as evidence
18	in this case if this matter went to trial, which
19	in addition to a more amplified statement made
20	in chambers would provide the basis for the
21	for the plea.
22	Ms. Alsworth?
23	MS. ALSWORTH: Yes, Your Honor. The State
24	would offer evidence in its case-in-chief that
25	would substantially prove the guilt of all three

defendants as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That on the evening of May 5, 1993, three children were reported missing, Steven Branch, Chris Bowers, and Michael Moore. The next day they -- their bodies were found in an area known as Robin Hood Hills. The State would provide evidence as to the cause of death for each of these children, the manner of death for each child, being that of the homicide. That in the course of the investigation by the West Memphis Police Department that the defendant, Jessie Misskelley, was interviewed and confessed to his participation. That the State would also provide testimony that defendant Baldwin made incriminating statements while he was in juvenile detention. And that defendant Echols also made incriminating statements to a group of individuals.

Additional direct and circumstantial evidence would be offered by the State to prove the guilt of the defendants and would corroborate the statements made by each.

THE COURT: All right, having heard those statements, Mr. Echols, what -- how do you wish to plea in this case?

MR. ECHOLS: Your Honor, I am innocent of 1 2 these charges, but I'm entering an Alford guilty 3 plea today based on the advice of my counsel and my understanding that it's in my best interest 4 to do so, given the entire record. 5 THE COURT: Have you been threatened or 6 7 coerced or intimidated in any way to give rise 8 to this plea? 9 MR. ECHOLS: No, sir, I have not. 10 THE COURT: And you are entering this plea 11 because you believe that it is in your best interest to do so, and want to go this route as 12 13 opposed to taking the risk of -- of higher 14 penalties and more -- and more penalties at 15 trial? 16 MR. ECHOLS: That's correct. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin, having heard the 18 statement made by the State as to a portion of 19 the proof that's expected in this case, how do 20 you choose to plea in this case? 21 MR. BALDWIN: Your Honor, first of all I am 22 innocent of murdering Chris Bowers, Michael 23 Moore and Stephen Branch; however, I've been 24 serving 18 years in the penitentiary for such.

I agree that it is in the State's best interest,

1	as well as my own, that based upon ${ m \underline{North}}$
2	Carolina versus Alford, that I plead guilty to
3	first-degree murder for those crimes.
4	THE COURT: All right, and the same as it
5	relates to you, Mr. Misskelley. How do you wish
6	to plea in response to the provable charges in
7	this case?
8	MR. MISSKELLEY: I am pleading guilty under
9	North Carolina versus Alford and the Arkansas
10	Rules although I am innocent. This is and
11	and this plea is in my best interest.
12	THE COURT: All right, thank you. Do each
13	of you, Mr. Echols, are you fully and completely
14	satisfied with the service, advice, council of
15	all your attorneys that have been representing
16	you in this case
17	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
18	THE COURT: in connection with these
19	post-conviction proceedings?
20	MR. ECHOLS: Very much so, yes.
21	THE COURT: All right, any complaints
22	whatsoever?
23	MR. ECHOLS: None.
24	THE COURT: And, Mr. Baldwin, I'll ask you
25	the same question. Are you fully and completely

1	satisfied with the service, advice, council of
2	your representatives attorney representatives
3	in this case that have handled these post-
4	conviction proceedings on your behalf?
5	MR. BALDWIN: Your Honor, I am.
6	THE COURT: Any complaints whatsoever?
7	MR. BALDWIN: No, sir.
8	THE COURT: And, Mr. Misskelley, I'll ask
9	you the same question. Are you fully and
10	completely satisfied with the service of your
11	attorney in handling these post-conviction
12	proceedings and advising you and getting us to
13	this point?
14	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir, I am.
15	THE COURT: Have any complaints whatsoever
16	<del></del>
17	MR. MISSKELLEY: No, sir
18	THE COURT: toward
19	MR. MISSKELLEY: I have none.
20	THE COURT: your counsel?
21	MR. MISSKELLEY: No, sir.
22	THE COURT: The Court finds that this is a
23	complying plea within that's a basis pursuant
24	to North Carolina versus Alford, that there is a

factual basis for the plea, and that the pleas

are voluntary and will be accepted and received 1 2 by the Court. 3 Having said that, the -- the plea agreement in this case indicates that, as relates to -- to 4 5 you, Mr. Echols, the proposed plea and sentence recommendation would be that, as to one count of 6 7 first-degree murder, you would be -- as to three 8 counts of first-degree murder, you'd be 9 sentenced to concurrent sentences of 216 months 10 and 78 days, 18 years and 78 days, in the 11 Department of Correction, with credit for that full sentence, 216 months and 78 days jail time, 12 13 followed on one count only by a 120-month period 14 of suspended imposition of sentence, subject to your compliance with certain terms and 15 16 conditions, all of which are set forth on 17 paperwork that you've been over with your 18 counsel and signed off on. Is that correct? 19 MR. ECHOLS: That's correct, sir. 20 THE COURT: And is that a correct statement 21 of the proposal in your particular case? 22 MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: And, Mr. Baldwin, as relates to 23 24 the proposed plea and sentence recommendation in

your case, the -- the same recommendation would

1	be made as relates to Mr. Echols; do you
2	understand that?
3	MR. BALDWIN: I do, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: And you understand that it
5	would be time served, and on one count it would
6	be subject to a 120-month period of suspended
7	imposition of sentence?
8	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: And, Mr. Misskelley, you
10	understand in your case that there'd be one
11	count of murder in the first degree with the
12	same basic sentence that's recommended in Mr.
13	Echols, Mr. Baldwin, and a 120-month period of
14	suspended imposition on that single count
15	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: with two with two counts
17	of second-degree, as was the result of your
18	first trial?
19	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: And is that the correct plea
21	and sentence recommendation in your case?
22	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
23	THE COURT: And in your case, Mr Mr.
24	Misskelley, you understand that if you should,
25	during the course of the 120-month period of

Ι	suspended imposition and sentence, fail to
2	comply in any way with those terms and
3	conditions, draw another charge or otherwise
4	violate that law or the conditions of your
5	suspended imposition, you could be that
6	that suspended sentence could be revoked and
7	you'd be required to serve an additional 252
8	months and 287 days, 21 years and 287 days, in
9	the Arkansas Department of Corrections? Do you
10	understand that?
11	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir, I understand.
12	THE COURT: And that has been fully
13	explained to you by counsel?
L 4	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: And you've signed off on
16	documentation to that effect?
17	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir, I have.
18	THE COURT: And, Mr. Echols, by the same
19	token, a violation or a failure to comply with
20	terms and conditions of your suspended
21	imposition of sentence during that time frame
22	would result in your being liable for up 252
23	months and 287 days, 21 years and 287 days,
24	additional in the Arkansas Department of
25	Corrections?

1	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: You've each been over and,
3	Mr. Baldwin, the same for you; is that correct?
4	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: You've each been over the
6	you've each been over your conditions of
7	suspended imposition, which are not necessarily
8	the same for each of you. There are differences
9	in, but you've been over them item by item with
10	your counsel and signed off on them in agreement
11	of those; is that correct, Mr. Echols?
12	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir, I have.
13	THE COURT: And, Mr. Baldwin?
14	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: And, Mr. Misskelley?
16	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
17	MALE VOICE: Your Honor, if you go do this,
18	you're going to open a Pandora's box.
19	FEMALE VOICE: That's right.
20	MR. BRANCH: You're going to give you're
21	going to give the key
22	FEMALE VOICE: They're murderers.
23	MALE VOICE: to everybody
24	THE COURT: Sir
25	FEMALE VOICE: on death row

1	THE COURT: sir, would you have
2	MALE VOICE: you'll be opening the cell
3	door.
4	THE COURT: a seat, please?
5	MALE VOICE: That's what you're going to
6	do.
7	FEMALE VOICE: They're murderers.
8	THE COURT: Have a seat, please.
9	MALE VOICE: That's what this precedent's
LO	going to do.
11	FEMALE VOICE: (unintelligible.)
12	MALE VOICE: You're wrong, Your Honor. You
13	can stop it right now if you will.
L 4	(Two male gentlemen escorted from the
15	courtroom.)
16	THE COURT: All right, the does anyone
17	have anything anything for the State to be
18	said before sentence is pronounced in this case?
19	MR. COPELIN: Nothing further.
20	THE COURT: Any defense counsel wish to
21	make any additional statement before sentence is
22	pronounced?
23	MR. BRAGA: Just briefly, Your Honor, I
24	would like to say that Mr. Echols has had ample

opportunity to discuss the arrangements to the

proposal, the sentencing recommendation from Mr.

Binka and I. He's gotten input from Mr. Riordan

and Mr. Horgan and Ms. Nirider through me. He's

a bright, intelligent young man. He's making a

voluntary decision.

THE COURT: All right, the Court finds each of the defendants guilty of first-degree murder, and the modified charges pursuant to the <u>Alford</u> case, even though they profess their innocence in connection with the matter. That's what this sort of plea is calculated to -- to do, and to give folks a reason, or a way, to -- to end a matter of this nature in the best interest of everybody concerned.

Having done that, the Court will now pronounce sentence in this case.

Mr. Echols, you will be -- each of you will be -- Mr. Echols, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Misskelley, you'll be each sentenced to serve 216 months and 78 days, 18 years and 78 days, in the Department of Correction on the charge of first-degree murder with full credit for that time already served, 216 months and 78 days, followed on one count of -- of first-degree murder in each of these cases, Mr. Echols, Mr. Baldwin, Mr.

Misskelley, of 120-month period of suspended
imposition of sentence, subject to designated
terms and conditions, which gives rise to
additional liability if you fail to comply with
any of the terms of the -- of the conditions.

As the Court indicated to you earlier on, this -- even though it's -- it's a guilty plea with a profession of innocence, it's a guilty plea under the law, and it will go down for future reference as such. And, in the event either of you should commit another offense of any sort, it could be used as a means of enhancing a sentence in that particular case just as if you had gone to trial and been convicted and sentenced.

Anything further to be offered by the state?

MR. COPELIN: Have they acknowledged that they read the rule -- the rules of suspended sentence?

THE COURT: They've each -- I've had them each acknowledged as we went along that they've been over the -- of the terms and conditions of the suspended imposition and signed off on them. That is correct, Mr. Echols?

1	MR. ECHOLS: Yes, sir.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Baldwin? Mr. Baldwin and
3	Mr. Misskelley?
4	MR. BALDWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
5	MR. MISSKELLEY: Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: All right, the Court, having
7	sentenced pursuant to the plea agreement, I'm
8	advised that the Department of Corrections
9	people are here to to put in place the
10	processing paperwork so it will not be necessary
11	for either of the defendants to be taken back to
12	the Department of Corrections and can be
13	processed out here. There's going to be
14	additional opportunities for some some media
15	contact with people, but not right now. We have
16	some processing things of that nature to do.
17	I want everyone to remain in the courtroom
18	at this point in time.
19	I'm going to allow the I'm going to
20	allow the defendants and counsel to take their
21	leave from the courtroom for the for the
22	State and the defense. I want everyone to
23	remain in the courtroom except counsel and the
24	parties that are subject to post-proceeding

interviews. State counsel may leave as well

1 and, as far as the plea agreement, the hearing 2 is concluded. 3 But I want -- I'm going to take about 10 minutes of your time, folks that are here in the 4 audience. 5 We're still in session. The Court's still 6 in session and I don't want any outbursts. 7 8 I commend you for -- for being orderly to 9 this point, and I want that to continue. I --10 the Court's very much aware -- the Court's very 11 much aware of the nature of this proceeding and -- and the extreme emotions that are there on 12 13 both sides of this particular matter. 14 And the Court takes no position as to -- as to what occurred when this tragedy occurred and 15 16 these innocent lives were taken. That's not 17 part of what I do in connection with this. 18 But I am aware of the divergence of opinion 19 about that. I'm aware of the controversy that's 20 existed. I'm aware of the involvement of the 21 people in this case, and I commend people in the 22 case that have assisted the defense, that have 23 assisted anyone in connection with this case

towards the end of seeing that justice is served

to the best that we could do. It has been

24

1 helpful.

bono, which means without pay. DNA sampling and expensive testing has been done by virtue of -- of money raised by caring, supporting people in support of the defendants in the case and I commend them for that. Sometimes outside help is in fact a big help in bringing -- in giving us something that we may not have ordinarily access to or resources to, so I -- so I appreciate that.

And -- and for those of you who are -- who have been a participant in that regard that are here, I commend you personally and publicly for -- for having done that.

This is -- it's hard to imagine a battle that has raged this long in a particular situation, and I realize that this result is confusing.

It's -- in the time that I've been on the bench, the better part of 14 years, I believe it's the first time we've ever used an <u>Alford</u> plea, but this was a proposal that came to me by agreement between counsel and not something that the Court suggested. But the Court does believe

that in this particular case, as I've stated,
that it is in the best interest of everyone at
this particular point.

The -- I think I pretty well set out exactly what the effect of this is. The -- there's not a lot of case law about this throughout the nation, except the United States Supreme Court case. And in Arkansas there's not really any precedent to amount to anything as to the exact nuts and bolts of the implementation of the Alford plea, although it's pretty well understood that an Alford plea is an acceptable way of disposition in Arkansas.

And we've had -- we've had -- we've had excellent working between counsel in this case.

Quite frankly, I held the earlier nonpublic hearing in this case in order that this

Court could be absolutely certain that there
were not any unanswered questions. There was no

-- it's one that ordinarily -- ordinarily
conferences like this occur when you have
counsel come in for the State and for the
defense and they meet with the judge and then
they come back out and then things happen in
public.

I believe that in this particular case,

because it's the right thing to do, that the defendants should be actively involved in the

4 process. I wanted them to be actively involved

5 in the process. I did not want to hear

6 secondhand from anyone what was going on. I

7 wanted to make sure that they were doing what

8 they wanted to do and -- and also to make sure

that they had been absolutely informed as to all

the ramifications of this, that the State and

11 everyone knew full well what was going on.

And once I satisfied myself of that -- and that was another reason that I was probably more vague about the aspects of the hearing than ordinary, because I wanted to make sure that that understanding, that level of understanding and informed agreement had occurred before we finalize it. And -- and I am pleased that we've done that.

So this won't answer all your questions. I don't expect it to. It will give rise to discussions for a long time to come. The -- I don't think it'll make the pain go away to the victim families. I don't think it'll make the pain go away to the defendant families. I don't

think it will take away a minute of the 18 years
that these three young men served in the
Arkansas Department of Corrections. What I just
described is tragedy on all sides.

And ordinarily I don't talk this much about

And ordinarily I don't talk this much about a case, but since I've got a captive audience here -- and I do believe that this is an unusual situation. It's an unusual disposition and I wanted to make sure that we are as transparent as we can be in this process.

Let's hold on just a minute. I'm not ready to release y'all quite yet. How long have we been, about 10 minutes? Okay, I think -- I think we're free to recess and I ask you to do it in an orderly fashion.

Let's -- let's let the media -- let's let the media proceed first; so bailiffs, if you'll help me with this process, we'll let the media proceed first.

All right, once our media gets out, then I would like for -- I would like for our victim family to be allowed to leave. Anyone connected with the victims' family. Victims' family.

And let's give them just two or three minutes, then -- then we'll escort the -- the

1	remaining persons from the courtroom.
2	Again, I appreciate your attendance and
3	hope for the best as things flesh out over the
4	next few weeks, months, and years.
5	(COURT REPORTER'S NOTE: Off the record.)

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ARKANSAS

COUNTY OF CRAIGHEAD

I, Dianne Gibson, certified court reporter for the Second Judicial District and notary public for the state of Arkansas, hereby certify that I reported the proceeding in the above-styled matter by voice writing, and the attached and foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my ability.

I further certify that the above and foregoing pages numbered one through 73 as set forth in typewriting, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceeding to the best of my ability, along with all items admitted into evidence.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL as such notary public and court reporter on September 7, 2011.

Dianne Gibson, CCR Supreme Court's Court Reporter Certificate #259

My Commission Expires:

07-29-12

\_\_\_\_\_