as if the rest of the parts of the woods looked.

## (WITNESS EXCUSED)

MR. FOGLEMAN: Your Honor, our next witness is Bryn Ridge. There are several photographs that we need to --

THE COURT: Do you need a short recess to go over them?

MR. FOGLEMAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you may take a ten minute recess with the usual admonition not to discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone.

(THE FOLLOWING CONFERENCE WAS HELD IN CHAMBERS)

MR. STIDHAM: I would like to object strenuously to what I think is improper behavior on the part of the State in trying to cause problems with my expert witness in the fact that they are attempting to have him removed from the courtroom when I have him subpoenaed here, and I think his testimony is imperative, and I think that is improper conduct on the State.

I don't think it is any concern of the prosecuting attorney what, if any, hearings my expert witness may have with his governing licensing board and I think that's totally improper for him to pursue

such a course of conduct against a witness in this case. I think it borders on intimidation.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir. It's the State's position if he puts himself out to be an expert and then whatever disciplinary hearings or actions are pending or scheduled against him, then the content of those clearly becomes relevant as to his credibility and his professional qualifications.

MR. STIDHAM: But it is not the prosecutor's job to speed up any process that would not ordinarily take place. It is not proper for the prosecuting attorney to go out and ensure --

THE COURT: You're talking in riddles. What specifically is the prosecutor doing that you're objecting to?

MR. STIDHAM: I understand the prosecuting attorney has contacted the Attorney General's Office and the licensing board for psychologists or psychiatrists, and he is trying to make sure that my expert witness is not in the courtroom on Friday but at this disciplinary hearing. I think that's entirely improper. The Court ruled on this the other day that he was not going to be allowed to go into that, and I think this is absolutely improper.

THE COURT: Are you suggesting that the 1 prosecuting attorney had scheduled and accelerated and 2 in some way caused a hearing to be set on Friday? 3 MR. STIDHAM: I'm not saying he caused a hearing 4 to be set on Friday. He is doing everything he 5 possibly can to make sure my witness is there as 6 opposed to being here. It is common knowledge or 7 accepted practice that when someone is subpoenaed to 8 be in the courtroom, they could get a continuance on a 9 hearing. Why is it all of a sudden real important for 10 the prosecuting attorney to seek this special 11 treatment for my expert witness? 12 MR. FOGLEMAN: It has been scheduled for four 13 14 vears. MR. STIDHAM: It has been continued many times. 15 THE COURT: How long has the hearing been set? 16 MR. STIDHAM: I don't know. 17 THE COURT: Who set it? 18 MR. STIDHAM: Mr. Davis knows --19 MR. DAVIS: Your Honor --20 THE COURT: -- I understand Mr. Davis trying to 21 find any credible evidence he can to refute your 22 witness' testimony. That is what the prosecutor gets 23 24 paid to do. What the Court is concerned about is a 25

representation was made this morning that he needed to be in the courtroom to hear all of the testimony.

Frankly, that is a discretionary call by the Court. I agreed to let the man stay in the courtroom. This was before the Court had been informed that he possibly had legal proceedings pending against him scheduled for Friday. I don't want my court to be used as a vehicle to avoid process on some other proceeding when it is not necessary that he be in court.

MR. STIDHAM: I don't think that is the case.

THE COURT: All I'm ruling is that he is entitled to be here. However, I don't think he needs to be here for the whole trial based on what you told me. I'm going to give him the opportunity to be here based upon your assertion that it's necessary. If he's scheduled for a hearing, then there's absolutely no reason why he can't go. We have ample television cameras in the courtroom. They can provide and will provide a color videotape of any testimony that he might miss. That tape can be taken with him, studied and reviewed over the weekend.

However, if his testimony is needed and if he's required to be here to testify on Friday, that is a different issue, but I don't see any reason why he can use this case as a basis for not meeting his --

1	MR. STIDHAM: Can I have his witnesses arrested
2	if they have outstanding warrants?
3	THE COURT: Do you have something specific
4	MR. STIDHAM: I know of a witness that has three
5	outstanding warrants, and I would like for
6	THE COURT: Go ahead. I don't care. Go ahead.
7	MR. STIDHAM: I think it is improper for the
8	prosecutor to be so concerned about making sure my
9	expert witness goes to his meeting.
10	THE COURT: That's what prosecutors do. I'm not
11	surprised nor perturbed by it. Now, what else?
12	MR. STIDHAM: The photographs we have been
13	provided by the State that they intend to introduce
14	through Officer Allen I'm sorry, Officer Ridge. We
15	don't have any would you read those off?
16	MR. CROW: We have no objection to 14, 15, 16,
17	18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 37, 37A, 37B, 38,
18	40, 41, 42, 56, 57, 58.
19	MR. STIDHAM: I understand the Court's ruling
20	with regard
21	MR. CROW: We make the general objection that
22	we raised in limine on the photographs. I understand
23	we make the general objection to the photographs we
24	discussed this morning. We raise our objection again
25	to any photographs of the victims.

MR. STIDHAM: Our concern is that one of the photographs of each of the victims depicting the condition of their bodies would seem to be sufficient. Duplicate photographs, which basically some of these are the same as these, and one of these is the same as have already been introduced by Officer Allen.

THE COURT: Refer to them by number. It looked to the Court as you were going through them that you are objecting to any view of the deceased bodies of any one of the three victims.

MR. CROW: As a general objection on the front end, your Honor, we would raise that objection.

MR. STIDHAM: I assume you have already ruled -THE COURT: All I have ruled is that you would
have to object specifically when it was raised. I
wouldn't as a matter of a motion in limine preclude
it. I'm assuming that the State can give a neutral
reason for each photograph as a necessity in its case.
If they cannot and you object, that's a different
matter. So take them one at a time and we'll go
through them.

MR. CROW: Start with 17.

MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, State's Exhibit 17 depicts the victim Branch as he is removed from the water and is being placed on the bank of the creek.

If that is the only photograph that they intend to introduce of the victim Branch -- our objection is we don't think it is proper for the State to introduce any of the pictures because their prejudicial value highly exceeds any probative value because the Medical Examiner and the officers who recovered the bodies can testify as to what the wounds in the body are. I think in a case involving children this area of prejudice is extremely magnified in it could tend to inflame the jurors and the courts have ruled that repeated photographs -- our alternative argument -- that repeated or repetitious photographs are not proper.

Our first objection would be that it should not be allowed at all because of the prejudice, and our alternative objection in light of the fact that we anticipate your Honor would rule that it's admissible is that only one photograph of each victim be allowed.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond? Number 17 right now.

MR. FOGLEMAN: Your Honor, as to Number 17, number one, that is a photograph of Branch. It depicts not only the condition of the body and the manner in which it's tied but also the condition of the water at the spot where he was removed.

MR. CROW: What is the relevance of the condition of the water?

MR. FOGLEMAN: I think it is going to go to the clean-up attempt that was made.

MR. STIDHAM: They have already introduced the photographs that show the water conditions.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow photograph 17. It shows clearly injuries to his face, the condition of his body as it was found, basically completely nude. Looks like there's some restraints on his body around one leg and what appears to be binding on one hand and where it appears that the other hand was bound and from this photograph it looks like it was shoestrings so I think there's relevant evidence there and based upon my recollection of Misskelley's statement, some of those matters are corroborative of his statement and some are not.

MR. FOGLEMAN: As to Exhibit 17 of the victim

Branch and any other photograph of the victim Branch

-- and this goes to probative value being outweighed

by prejudicial effect -- we want to proffer 114, 119,

121, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 138 and 139 as examples

of other photographs that we could have offered but

which we chose not to.

THE COURT: These are extremely gross and

gruesome photographs. I'm going to have these introduced or tagged as for identification purposes to show additional photographs of the victim Branch's condition immediately after being found and I would not allow those. So the Court is excluding these and they may be made a part of the record to establish to any appellate reviewer the fact that the Court has considered the nature of the photographs and finds that State's Exhibit 17 is certainly a reasonable photograph considering these others that are not being allowed.

(STATE'S EXHIBITS 114, 119, 121, 131, 132, 133,

135, 136, 138 AND 139 ARE RECEIVED FOR IDENTIFICATION)

MR. STIDHAM: You mentioned that your recollection of Mr. Misskelley's statement -- if we assume for purposes of our argument with regard to these photographs that his statement is correct, we certainly don't submit that it is -- but for purposes of argument let's assume for a moment that it is -- Mr. Misskelley never touched any of these victims or struck them, hit them, killed them, raped them --

THE COURT: Seems like -- I don't remember where I read it -- but I recall him saying something to the effect that one of the other defendants struck one of the boys real bad. He also made some contradictory

1 statements about how they were tied. And what was done with their bodies and where it occurred and some 2 3 of those things are corroborative and some of them are 4 not. It depicts the crime scene, the location of the 5 body and certainly that is relevant to any issue the 6 State has to prove. It is also relevant to some 7 extent to show the degree of injury sustained by these 8 victims. 9 MR. STIDHAM: The point I'm trying to make -- our 10 argument is, Judge, that Mr. Misskelley did not 11 inflict those wounds --12 THE COURT: I understood what you said. 13 The jury might be inflamed by the MR. STIDHAM: 14 injuries which were inflicted by the others and that 15 might prejudice Mr. Misskelley. 16 MR. FOGLEMAN: I think the jury can fairly 17 conclude -- they can draw their own conclusions of 18 whether or not Mr. Misskelley inflicted any wounds. 19 MR. STIDHAM: I will move on. 20 State's Exhibit 20 depicts, I believe, the victim 21 Moore. 22 MR. FOGLEMAN: That is Branch. MR. STIDHAM: That's Branch. It depicts the 23 24 victim Branch being removed from the water and again 25 our objection would be the same as to Exhibit 17 and

4 evidence depicting the body being in the water. THE COURT: This is a totally and completely 5 6 different view and if the State maintains some 7 relevancy, I'm going to allow it. I have seen a lot 8 worse than that. 9 MR. STIDHAM: Exhibit 22 depicts the victim 10 Moore. We would make the same objection to it. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. It is not -- while it 12 does depict an eight-year-old boy nude with facial 13 injuries, it is not that gross or prejudicial. It 14 does show the deceased remains as it was located. 15 MR. STIDHAM: State's Exhibit 23 depicts the same 16 thing as in 22 and we object as to repetition and also 17 the same arguments we had with 17. MR. FOGLEMAN: This particular picture is mainly 18 19 showing the condition of the bank. 20 MR. CROW: There are other pictures of the bodies 21 that show the bank. 22 MR. FOGLEMAN: They don't show the bank like 23 these do. They are closer. 24 MR. STIDHAM: We disagree with the prosecutor. 25 THE COURT: It is a different view and it does

we would submit that the photograph is repetitious due

bodies were removed. There's a photograph already in

to the fact that Officer Allen testified how the

1

2

3

1	show the left leg restraints connected to the right
2	wrist. I'm going to allow it.
3	MR. STIDHAM: What does this show?
4	MR. FOGLEMAN: I'm not sure I don't
5	MR. STIDHAM: Number 27 we object to anything
6	that they don't know what it is.
7	MR. FOGLEMAN: I said I didn't. That doesn't
8	mean the witnesses don't.
9	THE COURT: I'm going to allow 23.
10	MR. STIDHAM: Exhibit 24 shows the victim Byers
11	and his sexual mutilation and our specific objection
12	to that would be that that is a very shocking and
13	gruesome photograph and while it does show the
14	injuries to the victim, it is particularly gruesome
15	and that is something the Medical Examiner could
16	testify to.
17	THE COURT: How many pictures of this nature do
18	you have?
19	MR. FOGLEMAN: We would proffer on the victim
20	Byers 130 and 200 to show that we have chosen a much
21	less offensive picture.
22	THE COURT: I'm going to allow State's Exhibit 24
23	and the State is proffering 130 and 200.
24	(STATE'S EXHIBITS 130 AND 200 ARE RECEIVED FOR
25	IDENTIFICATION)

1 MR. FOGLEMAN: By proffering those we are not necessarily admitting that they are so gruesome that 2 the jury shouldn't see them. We are saying we have 3 chosen a much less offensive photograph. THE COURT: These likewise will be received for 5 identification purposes for any possible appellate 6 review that might be necessary to determine the extent 7 8 and scope of the Court's review of the photographs and I think they depict that the State has chosen Exhibit 9 24 which is much less gruesome. 10 MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, State's Exhibit 26 11 12 depicts the victim --MR. FOGLEMAN: It is Moore. 13 14 MR. STIDHAM: All it shows is feet and genitalia. I assume the photograph is being submitted to show the 15 condition of the bank. We submit it would be much 16 17 more probative without the victim's body and 18 genitalia. THE COURT: It also shows his right extremities 1.9 20 bound by what appears to be a shoestring and shows that his right hand is clenched into a fist. 21 22 MR. STIDHAM: I don't know how that is relevant. MR. FOGLEMAN: To show the manner in which he is 23 24 tied and the condition of the bank. Your Honor, I 25 don't know that we actually have a photograph that

1 2 3 4 . cleaned up. 5 THE COURT: I'm going to allow that. 6 7 the picture? 8 9 almost going to have to view the body. 10 11 12 13 prejudice outweighs the probative value. 14 15 16 17 18 motion will be denied. 19 20 21 2.2 photographs. 23 THE COURT: They may be received for 24 identification purposes for review. 25

shows the detail that this does on the bank. will look at the photograph, you can see all the scuff marks and grass with the mud on it where it has been

MR. STIDHAM: Can we cut part of the body out of

THE COURT: I don't see any need to. The jury is

MR. STIDHAM: State's Exhibit 33, 35, 36, and 39. We would submit that these pictures basically all show the same thing and they are repetitious and the

THE COURT: I'm going to rule that 33, 35, 36 and 39 are not particularly ugly photographs and that the prejudicial effect, if any, certainly doesn't outweigh any probative value that they might have so your

MR. FOGLEMAN: As to the victim Moore, we have also proffered 106, 113 and 201 -- we would proffer those to show that we have chosen less gruesome

(STATE'S EXHIBITS 106, 113 AND 201 ARE RECEIVED

## FOR IDENTIFICATION)

MR. STIDHAM: That leaves us with 78 and 79 showing Mr. Misskelley at the time of his arrest. We object to the relevancy of his arrest photograph. His appearance on June third is that but his appearance on May 5th was nowhere near that. The fact that he chose to go out and get a squirrelly haircut like some wrestler on TV -- I think it is very prejudicial and does not accurately depict the way he looked on May 5th.

MR. FOGLEMAN: I guess they can have somebody testify about that. This whole case comes down to Jessie's credibility, whether he is deceiving somebody or not, and the way he appears then -- now they've got him sitting out there looking like a choir boy -- and I think we've got the right to show the jury the way he is now is not the true Jessie Misskelley.

MR. STIDHAM: That ain't the true Jessie Misskelley there. I don't see any relevancy.

THE COURT: If this is the way he looked at the time of his arrest or in any close proximity, then I'm going to allow the photographs. That will be a matter of you verifying by proof --

MR. FOGLEMAN: The proof will be that was at the time of his arrest.

-1	THE COURT: Exhibits 78 and 79, if it is verified
2	that is the way he looked immediately prior to or
3	after the event, then I'm going to allow them.
4	MR. CROW: Note our objection.
5	(RETURN TO OPEN COURT)
6	BRYN RIDGE
7	having been first duly sworn to speak the truth, the whole truth
8	and nothing but the truth, then testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. FOGLEMAN:
11	Q Will you please state your name and occupation?
12	A Bryn Ridge, detective for the West Memphis Police
13	Department.
14	Q How long have you been in law enforcement?
15	A Over ten years.
16	Q Detective Ridge, I want to direct your attention to May 6,
17	1993. What part, if any, did you play in the investigation of
18	the disappearance of Michael Moore, Steve Branch and Chris
19	Byers?
20	A I participated in the search for the missing juveniles and
21	also in the discovery of the bodies.
22	Q Approximately what time did you begin your search efforts?
23	A About 7:30 A.M.
24	Q What area were you assigned to search?
25	A I went first to Robin Hood Hills, this park on North