

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

04 JUN 16 AM 9:24

DISTRICT COURT
N.D. OF ALABAMA

dc

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
ERIC ROBERT RUDOLPH,)
Defendant.)

§
CR-00-~~N~~-0422-S

**REPLY TO
UNITED STATES' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
RUDOLPH'S REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY OF MATERIALS RELATED
TO THE SCIENTIFIC TESTING OF ATLANTA BOMBING EVIDENCE**

Introduction

COMES NOW the defendant, by and through undersigned counsel, and files this reply to the *United States' Memorandum in Opposition to Rudolph's Request for Discovery of Materials Related to the Scientific Testing of Atlanta Bombing Evidence*, filed on May 27, 2004. (hereinafter "Opposition").

The government is correct in asserting that because the government will not introduce any Atlanta bombing evidence in its case-in-chief, disclosure of the fourteen categories of information requested in defendant's motion for discovery of lab bench notes and other items (Doc. 238) is not warranted under part of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure Rule 16(a)(1)(E) or 16(a)(1)(F). However, as the government also correctly notes, those same sections, as well as *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963), mandate disclosure of the requested information if the defendant makes a specific request for the information "together with an explanation of how it will be helpful to the defense. *United States v. Jordan*,

Av. CLS

243

316 F.3d 1215, 1250 (11th Cir. 2003).” (Opposition at 6).¹ For three reasons, the requested information would be helpful to the defense, regardless of whether the government chooses to introduce the Atlantic bombing evidence in its case-in- chief.

First, the government has in fact filed an unsealed indictment charging Mr. Rudolph with the Atlanta offenses and both before and after these charges were filed government officials have engaged in a relentless media campaign to let the world know its view that Mr. Rudolph is guilty of those charges as well as the Birmingham offenses. As will be amply demonstrated at the change of venue hearing, government officials, including the Attorney General and other high governmental officials, have repeatedly expressed the view in press conferences and other very public forums that Eric Rudolph is guilty of the Atlanta offenses.²

¹ The court in *Jordon* cites *United States v. Marshall*, 132 F.3d 63, 67-68 (D.C.Cir.1998) for the proposition that “‘helpful’ means relevant to preparation of the defense *and not necessarily exculpatory*”, although the court (and the government in this case) also cite *United States v. Buckley*, 586 F.2d 498, 506 (5th Cir.1978) for the somewhat inconsistent proposition that “the defendant must show more than that the [item] bears some abstract logical relationship to the issues in the case.... There must be some indication that the pretrial disclosure of the [item] would ... enable [] the defendant significantly to alter the quantum of proof in his favor.”. 316 F. Ed at 1250. (Emphasis added, internal quotations omitted). But see, *United States v. Bagley*, 473 U.S. 667, 682, 105 S.Ct. 3375, 3383, 87 L.Ed.2d 481 (1985) (the Supreme Court defined materiality as a showing that “there is a reasonable probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to the defense, the result of the proceeding would have been different.”) . The court in *United States v. Liquid Sugars, Inc.*, 158 F.R.D. 466, 471-472 (E.D. Ca. 1994) specifically held that “(t)he court's definition of materiality for purposes of reviewing discovery requests pre-trial does not conflict with established precedent that imposes a more strict materiality standard when seeking to reverse a conviction on appeal.” 158 F.R.D. at 472. The Court persuasively reasoned that “(t)he Court of Appeal has the benefit of hindsight, i.e., it can assess the significance of the requested, but not disclosed, evidence against the backdrop of precisely what facts were introduced at trial which demonstrate the defendant's guilt. Prior to trial, this court has no such benefit. Requiring a district court to predict what will change the verdict months before it is ever decided is a markedly impossible directive.” (Id.). Accord, *United States v. Siegfried*, 2000 WL 988164 (N.D. Ill. 2000).

² See e.g., “Is Witness Tied To Atlanta,” *Birmingham Post Herald*, February 6, 1998, (continued...)

²(...continued)

page 01-A (“ I am sure that the Atlanta Bombing Task Force is looking into all of the possible connections between their case and Birmingham, said Bill King, spokesman for the Atlanta Office of the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. ‘That will probably include checking to see if Rudolph matches any of the people they are looking for’, he said. Craig Dahle, spokesman for the Birmingham office of the FBI said he had not compared the pictures but that certainly someone involved in the case had. ‘I’m sure that all of that is being looked at,’ he said. ‘Others have probably made the observation that Rudolph looks like one or more of those composites.”); “Experts See Links In Attacks,” *Birmingham Post Herald*, February 16, 1998, page 01-A (“ [A]uthorities have said all three Atlanta bombings appeared to be connected.”); “FBI Agents Search for Rudolph In Caves,” *Birmingham Post Herald*, February 19, 1998, page 01-B (“ Brian Lett, a spokesmen for the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms in Birmingham said Wednesday that ‘ Eric’s involvement is based on facts, evidence and eyewitness accounts.’ ... Investigators have said there are similarities between the Georgia and Alabama cases, but they have not established a definite link.”); “Nails in Rudolph Shed Linked to Atlanta Bomb,” *Birmingham News*, February 26, 1998, page: 01-A (“Laboratory tests have linked the suspect in the bombing of a Birmingham abortion clinic and nails used in the 1997 bombing of an Atlanta women's clinic, a source close to the investigation said Wednesday. The source, speaking on condition of anonymity, said a lab analysis concluded the 1 1/2-inch cut flooring nails used as shrapnel in the Atlanta bomb came from the same batch as a small number of nails found in a storage shed rented by Eric Robert Rudolph in North Carolina. This kind of nail is cut by a machine, leaving unique tool marks, the source said. He compared the machine's marks to those left on a bullet when it's fired from a gun.”); “Agents Probing If Rudolph Was With Protester,” *Birmingham Post Herald*, February 28, 1998, page 01-A (“On Friday, a report in *The New York Times* linked Rudolph to steel plates used in bombs at the 1996 Olympics and at an Atlanta abortion clinic in 1997. The plates in the Atlanta bombs were cut from steel found at a metal-working plant in Franklin, N.C., that employed a friend of Rudolph, according to unidentified federal officials who spoke to the *Times*.”). “Topped Plant Baited Abortion Clinic Bomb,” *Birmingham News*, March 8, 1998, page: 01-A (“Joseph Lewis, special agent in charge of the Birmingham FBI office...said the criminal complaint against Rudolph wouldn't have been issued without sufficient evidence, but investigators still have a 'long way to go' in their work. ” A lot remains unanswered, but we're feeling pretty good about the case. Is it dead-bang, 100 percent, no doubts? No,' he said. 'But this is as close as you can get.' Lewis said there are similarities between the Birmingham bombing and bombings in Atlanta.”); “Officials Approve of Combined Task Force,” *Birmingham Post Herald*, March 19, 1998, page 01-D (“ Doug Jones, U.S. Attorney in Birmingham, said Wednesday that the investigation will look into possible links between Eric Robert Rudolph, the only named suspect in the Birmingham bombing, and two Atlanta bombings. ‘Our investigation has settled down’, Jones said. It was obviously very intense...’ ... Laboratory analysis shows that one and a half inch flooring nails used in the clinic bombings in Birmingham and Atlanta came from the same batch as nails found in the storage shed rented by Rudolph, a federal agent said. The batch of nails ‘ was produced and sold in a small area,’ the agent said.”); “\$1 Million for Rudolph FBI Plans to Boost Reward, Add

(continued...)

The effect of this concerted media campaign has been devastating to Eric Rudolph's chance for a fair trial anywhere in Alabama and perhaps even in other parts of the United States . Illustrative is a nationwide poll of 900 registered voters who were asked in June of 2003, "Based

²(...continued)

Bombing Suspect to Most-Wanted List," *Birmingham News*, April 30, 1998, p 01-A (" Links between Rudolph and the Atlanta bombings so far could be merely coincidences, said a senior agent on the case, who requested anonymity. 'But in this business if you can pile up enough coincidences, sometimes you get somewhere,' the agent said.... Agents hypothesize that the same person or people were behind all three Atlanta attacks. The Olympic and Atlanta abortion clinic bombs had 1/8-inch thick steel plates, designed to direct the blasts. These plates were long ago found to have the same general formulation of steel, the agent said. Some of the manufacturers who make that type of steel sold it in the Southeastern states, including to a metalworking plant in Franklin, N.C., where an associate of Rudolph's worked, the agent added. Another federal agent said lab analysis showed that 1 1/2-inch flooring nails used in the bombs in Birmingham and at the Atlanta abortion clinic came from the same batch as nails found in a storage shed rented by Rudolph. The batch of nails "was produced and sold in a small area," this agent said."); Lyons Hopes Reward Works, *Birmingham Post Herald*, August 6, 1998, page 01-D ("Some similarities in the (Atlanta) bombings indicate the possibility that the crimes are related,' FBI Director Louis Freeh said in Washington... Officials stopped short of calling Rudolph a suspect in the Atlanta cases because there is not enough evidence to charge him with those attacks... Nevertheless, Freeh said he saw 'a significant linkage' between the Birmingham and Atlanta cases."); "Atlanta Bombing Links Reported," *Birmingham Post Herald*, September 16, 1998, page 01-D (" Federal investigators have found more evidence linking abortion clinic bombing suspect Eric Rudolph to three bombings in Atlanta, an FBI spokesman said. Woody Enderson, agent in charge of the Southeast Bomb Task Force, said investigators have developed additional evidence connecting Rudolph to the Atlanta attacks, but he declined to elaborate."); "Rudolph Is Olympics Suspect," *Birmingham Post Herald*, October 14, 1998, page 01-B (" The complaint was to be filed as soon as Justice Department officials were able to schedule a news conference to announce it, perhaps as early as today, according to these officials, who requested anonymity. The decision to bring charges came now because 'we have the evidence to support it,' a senior federal law enforcement official said Tuesday... [I]nvestigators have assembled 'all kinds of pieces' linking Rudolph to the Atlanta blasts, one investigator said Tuesday."); "Officials Seek Help In Capturing Rudolph," *Birmingham Post Herald*, October 15, 1998, page 01-F ("Accompanying [Attorney General] Reno, FBI Director Louis Freeh said the new charges were filed because agents have assembled 'a very strong and substantial case against Mr Rudolph with respect to the Olympic bombing' and the other Atlanta attacks."); "Rudolph Trial Here-Ashcroft: 'Best Opportunity in Birmingham," *Birmingham Post Herald*, June 2, 2003, page 01-A (" Ashcroft said the legal maneuver-- of trying Rudolph for a single bombing case in Alabama before trying him in three other bombing cases in Georgia--will 'provide the best opportunity to bring justice to all of the victims of the bombings and to each community taht experienced these attacks. Ashcroft predicted that Rudolph's first trial in the Northern District of Alabama will be 'relatively short and straightforward.'")

on what you know right now, do you think Eric Rudolph was involved in the Atlanta Olympic Park and other bombings he's charged with committing? Is that definitely (involved/not involved) or probably (involved/not involved)?³ Thirty three percent of the respondents thought Rudolph was "definitely involved" and another 29 percent of the respondents thought he was "probably involved". Significantly, the poll found that "[t]hose living in the South Atlantic region of the country, which includes Georgia, the site of the Olympic bombing, as well as North Carolina where Rudolph was discovered, are the most likely to believe he was involved (74 percent)."

Under these circumstances, the defense cannot sit idly by and allow the government to take advantage of a government created presumption of guilt which will cast its dark shadow over Rudolph's trial for the Birmingham offense regardless of whether the government now wishes to belatedly banish the word "Atlanta" from the formal vocabulary of his trial. The Supreme Court in *Marshall v. United States*, 360 U.S. 310, 312-313, 79 S.Ct. 1171, 3 L.Ed.2d 1250 (1959), in the exercise of its supervisory powers, granted a new trial to defendant when news accounts of defendant's criminal record reached some of the jurors. The trial judge had found such evidence inadmissible. The United States Supreme Court said:

"The prejudice to defendant is almost certain to be as great when that evidence reaches the jury through news accounts as when it is part of the prosecutions evidence . . . It may indeed be greater for it is then not tempered by protected procedures. In the exercise of our supervisory powers to apply proper standards for enforcement of the criminal laws in the Federal courts, . . . we think a new trial should be granted."

If, as the defense suspects, the scientific evidence trying Eric Rudolph to the Atlanta offenses is flawed, the defense needs to know that information now so that it can decide whether

³ <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,88944,00.html>. The poll was conducted for Fox News by Opinion Dynamics Corporation.

to affirmatively use that evidence in the guilt or penalty phase of the Birmingham case to establish Mr. Rudolph's innocence and to erase the false accusations already imbedded by the government in the public mind before the trial has even begun. The government has gone down the path of alleging that the Birmingham and Atlanta offenses were all committed by the same person, namely Eric Rudolph. To the extent that the defense can show that the scientific evidence allegedly tying him to any one of the offenses is flawed and in fact points to someone else, a reasonable doubt will be created for the Birmingham defenses. Because the Atlanta offenses are therefore very much at issue for the defense, the underlying lab data is highly material for all of the reasons stated in defendant's discovery motion.

Second, in its notice of intent to seek the death penalty, the government has alleged as a non-statutory aggravating factor that "[t]he Defendant, ERIC ROBERT RUDOLPH, is likely to commit criminal acts of violence in the future which would be a continuing and serious threat to the lives and safety of others." The government has also specified that it only intends to rely on the Birmingham offenses and the vague allegations of lack of rehabilitative potential and lack of remorse to support an argument of future dangerousness. However, "[t]he Due Process Clause will not tolerate placing a capital defendant in a straitjacket by barring him from rebutting the prosecution's arguments of future dangerousness..." *Simmons v. South Carolina*, 512 U. S. 154, 166 n. 5 (1994). See also, *Skipper v. South Carolina*, 476 U.S. 1, 5 n. 1 (1986)(where the prosecution relies on a prediction of future dangerousness in requesting the death penalty, elemental due process principles operate to require admission of the defendant's relevant evidence in rebuttal); *Gardner v. Florida*, 430 U.S. 349, 362 (1977) ("We conclude that petitioner was denied due process of law when the death sentence was imposed, at least in part, on the basis of information which he had no opportunity to deny or explain."); *United States v. Johnson*, 223 F.3d 665, 674-675 (7th Cir. 2000) ("the defendant was of course entitled to counter

the government's evidence that he would be a continued menace to society while in prison, that being evidence offered to establish an aggravating factor”)

Relevant evidence in rebuttal to an allegation of future dangerousness must include forensic and other evidence indicating that the defendant has no history of other criminal activity. All experts on the topic of future dangerousness agree that “[p]revious instances of violent behavior are an important indicator of future violent tendencies.” *Heller v. Doe by Doe*, 509 U.S. 312, 323 (1993) (collecting scientific literature). The opposite is also true. The lack of previous instances of violence is an important indicator of future non-violence. By exploring the weaknesses in the government’s forensic evidence allegedly connecting him to the Atlanta offenses, the defense hopes to build a solid foundation for an expert opinion that for a variety of reasons, including most importantly his lack of prior criminal history, Mr. Rudolph will not pose a future danger to anyone. See, *Hanson v. State*, 72 P. 3d 40 (Okla. Crim. App. 2003) (“The State alleged that Hanson would probably continue to commit acts of violence posing a continuing threat to society. Hanson had a constitutional right to rebut that allegation by presenting expert evidence regarding his future dangerousness.”)

Third, regardless of the government’s allegation of future dangerousness, at the penalty phase, the defense is entitled to prove, as an independent mitigating factor under 18 U.S. C. Section 3592 (a)(5), that he does “not have a significant prior history of other criminal conduct.” Consideration of this factor is also compelled under the Eighth Amendment. “The absence of . . . violent criminal activity . . . [is a] significant mitigating circumstanc[e] in a capital case, where the accused frequently has an extensive criminal past.” *People v. Crandall*, 46 Cal.3d 833, 884 (1988). See also, *Siripongs v. Calderon*, 35 F.3d 1308, 1323 (9th Cir. 1994) (In ordering an evidentiary hearing on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, the court commented that “[o]f particular relevance may be counsel's failure to request an instruction that the defendant had

no prior violent criminal record."); *Aldridge v. Dugger*, 925 F.2d 1320, 1330 (11th Cir. 1991) (fact defendant had no previous convictions for violent crime was a valid mitigating factor).

In *Lashley v. Armontrout*, 957 F.2d 1495 (8th Cir. 1992), the Eighth Circuit agreed that the state trial court violated the Eighth Amendment by refusing to give the mitigating-circumstance instruction defendant requested, i.e., "The defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity." *Id.* at 1501. Importantly, the federal court found reversible error even though the defendant had not come forward with proof of the negative facts supporting the instruction. The Court concluded that "*Lockett* requires the State — which is in a peculiarly advantageous position to show a significant prior criminal history . . . to come forward with evidence; or else the court must tell the jury it may consider the requested mitigating circumstance." *Id.* at 1502.

However, the decision in *Lashley v. Armontrout* 957 F.2d 1495 (8th Cir. 1993) was overruled by the Supreme Court in *Delo v. Lashley* 507 U.S. 272, 113 S.Ct. 1222, 122 L. Ed. 2d 620 (1993). The Court concluded that "[t]oday we make explicit the clear implication of our precedents: Nothing in the Constitution obligates state courts to give mitigating circumstance instructions when no evidence is offered to support them. Because the jury heard no evidence concerning Lashley's prior criminal history, the trial judge did not err in refusing to give the requested instruction." *Id.* at 277.

Under *Delo*, in order for the defendant to take advantage of the significant mitigating factor of no prior criminal history, the defendant must come forward with proof that he committed no prior offenses. As stated in *Delo*, the Supreme Court has "never... suggested that the Constitution requires a ... trial court to instruct the jury on mitigating circumstances in the absence of any supporting evidence" and the government "may require the defendant to bear the risk of nonpersuasion as to the existence of mitigating circumstances." *Id.* at 276 (internal

quotations omitted). See also, *Hill v. Moore*, 175 F. 3d 915, 918 n. 19 (11th Cir 1994) (“In capital cases, the Constitution requires the trial courts to charge the jury on a statutory mitigating circumstance only if the evidence so warrants.”). Mr. Rudolph cannot be expected to discharge this burden in this case unless he is given access to those items requested in his motion which the government has essentially conceded are necessary to a full and fair investigation of the *charged* crime. The same information must also be necessary to a full and fair investigation of *uncharged* crimes whose absence the defendant must prove in order to establish the compelling mitigating factor of a lack of a significant prior history of other criminal conduct.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for any or all of the foregoing reasons, Mr. Rudolph requests this Court to enter an order granting his motion for discovery as it relates to the Atlanta offenses.

Respectfully submitted,
RICHARD JAFFE
BILL BOWEN
JUDY CLARKE
MICHAEL BURT
EMORY ANTHONY
Counsel for Eric Robert Rudolph

Dated: June 16, 2004

BY: Michael Burt
MICHAEL BURT

Richard S. Jaffe (JAF004)
JAFFE, STRICKLAND & DRENNAN, P.C.
The Alexander House
2320 Arlington Avenue
Birmingham, Alabama 35205
Telephone: (205) 930-9800
Facsimile: (205) 930-9809

Michael Burt
LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL BURT
600 Townsend St., Suite 329-E
San Francisco, California 94103
Telephone: (415) 522-1508
Facsimile: (415) 522-1506

Judy Clarke
FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO, INC.
225 Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 544-2720
Facsimile: (619) 374-2908

Emory Anthony
LAW OFFICES OF EMORY ANTHONY
2015 First Ave. North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Telephone: (205) 458-1100
Facsimile: (205) 328-6957

William M. Bowen, Jr. (BOW012)
WHITE, ARNOLD, ANDREWS & DOWD P.C.
2902 21st Street North, Suite 600
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Telephone: (205) 323-1888
Facsimile: (205) 323-8907

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that I have served upon the attorney for the prosecution the above pleading by facsimile and by placing a copy of same in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid, and properly addressed to:

Michael W. Whisonant
Robert J. McLean
Will Chambers
Assistants United States Attorney
U. S. Department of Justice
Office of United States Attorney
Northern District of Alabama
1801 Fourth Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203-2101
Facsimile: 244-2183

This the 16th day of June, 2004.



Bill Bowen