Terri Wood OSB 88332 730 Van Buren Street Eugene, Oregon 97402

Attorney for Defendant

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY

STATE OF OREGON.

Plaintiff,

-VS-

 $\| XX$ 

Defendant

CASE No. XXXXXX

DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY
AND BRADY MATERIALS; AND,
ALTERNATIVE EX-PARTE MOTION
FOR SUBPOENAS DUCES TECUM IN
ADVANCE OF TRIAL

COMES NOW the defendant and makes written demand upon the Multnomah County District Attorney, pursuant to ORS 135.815, 135.825 and 135.845, and the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, and such other authorities as are cited herein and in the Defendant's Memorandum of Law in support of his discovery requests, incorporated by reference herein, to forthwith disclose the following material information within its possession or control, or which may at any time hereafter come into its possession or control while this cause is pending; and, the defense further requests the Court, pursuant to ORS 135.865, to order inspection of, or grant other appropriate relief, as to any of the materials requested herein that have not been provided by the State by [DATE CERTAIN]; or, DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

alternatively, Defendant moves, pursuant to ORS 136.580(2), for the Court to direct the defense to issue subpoenas duces tecum for such records or documents demanded herein which the Court finds are outside the scope of statutory discovery rights, requiring such records or documents to be produced before the Court prior to trial to be inspected and copied by the parties' attorneys:

- 1. The names and addresses of persons intended to be called as witnesses at any stage of the trial, including anticipated impeachment and rebuttal witnesses, together with all relevant written or recorded statements or memorandum of any oral statements of such persons, including memorandum or recorded statements of witnesses prepared by the District Attorney or his agents.
- 2. Any written or recorded statements or memorandum of any oral statements made by the defendant, or made by co-defendants, if any; and all oral statements of the defendant and any codefendant to any government agent, even if unrecorded in written or electronic media.
- 3. Any reports or statements of experts made in connection with this particular case, including results of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests, experiments or comparisons which the District Attorney intends to offer in evidence at the trial.
- 4. Any books, papers, documents, photographs or tangible objects which the District Attorney intends to offer in evidence at the trial, including for impeachment or during rebuttal, or which were obtained from or belonged to the defendant.
- 5. If actually known to the District Attorney, any record of prior criminal convictions of persons whom the District Attorney intends to call as witnesses at the trial.
  - 6. A written copy of any record of prior criminal convictions of the defendant.
- 7. All original notes and electronic recordings, now in existence or hereafter made, of police officers and/or investigators on behalf of the State, including staff of SCF and DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

C.A.R.E.S. Northwest, relating to this case, including any agent's underlying rough notes of the statements requested in items 1 and 2 above.

- 8. The occurrence of a search or seizure, the circumstances of that search or seizure, any relevant material or information obtained thereby including a list of the items seized; and the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of any statements made by the defendant to any witness or other person. ORS §135.825(1) & (2).
  - 9. The description of any prior similar or bad act the State will seek to introduce at trial.
- 10. Any and all exculpatory evidence which the State may have in its possession or control, including but not limited to the following items:
- 11. Any impeachment material from the personnel files of each law enforcement agent, or any other state agent, including staff of SCF and C.A.R.E.S. Northwest, who will testify in the case, including any evidence that the agent has been accused of making a false statement or engaging in any deceptive conduct; if the prosecutor is uncertain about what to disclose, the court is requested to conduct a further examination *in camera*. See *United States v. Henthorn*, 931 F.2d 29 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 112 S.Ct. 1588 (1992).
- 12. All notes or other writings or documents used by a prospective State witness before the grand jury. *United States v. Wallace*, 848 F.2d 1464, 1470 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988).
- 13. The names and addresses of all percipient witnesses interviewed by the State whom the State does not intend to call at the trial. *United States v. Cadet*, 727 F.2d 1453, 1469 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984).
- 14. The arrest and conviction record of each prospective State witness. *United States v. Strifler*, 851 F.2d 1197, 1202 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) (criminal records of witnesses must be disclosed even if contained in witness's probation file), *cert. denied*, 109 S.Ct. 1170 (1989); *Perkins v. Lefevre*, 691 F.2d 616 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1982). The State is required to search both national and local criminal record files. *See United States v. Perdomo*, 929 F.2d at 970-71.

DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

15. Any evidence that a criminal case has been dismissed against any prospective State witness while the case against Mr. Defendant was under investigation or otherwise pending. See United States v. Anderson, 881 F.2d 1128, 1138-39 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

- 16. Any evidence that any prospective State witness has any criminal charge pending against him. *United States v. Fried*, 486 F.2d 201 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1973), *cert. den.* 416 U.S. 983 (1975); *United States v. Maynard*, 476 F.2d 1170, 1174 (D.C. Cir. 1973)(pending indictment relevant to bias and motive of witness).
- 17. Any evidence that any prospective State witness is under investigation by federal or state authorities. *United States v. Chitty*, 760 F.2d 425, 428 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir.), cert. den., 474 U.S. 945 (1985).
- 18. Any evidence of express or implicit understandings, offers of immunity, special treatment while in custody, or of past, present, or future compensation between the State or any of its agents and any prospective State witness or any friend or member of the witnesses' family. *See Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) (agreement not to prosecute); *United States v. Schaffer*, 789 F.2d 682, 689 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986) (moneys paid for ongoing undercover cooperation in another case); *United States v. Butler*, 567 F.2d 885, 889 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978) (prosecutor's "assurances" of future benefits); *Brown v. Wainwright*, 785 F.2d 1457, 1465 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986)(implicit understanding must be disclosed even if no "promise" and even if conditional)..
- 19. Any evidence that any prospective witness, or attorney for the witness, has applied to, or requested from, the State any consideration or benefit including but not limited to any plea bargain, dismissal of any charge, sentence reduction or early parole, or copies of police reports or other information regarding defendant, whether or not the State agreed to such a request. *Reutter v. Solem*, 888 F.2d 578, 581 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989); *Brown v. Dugger*, 831 F.2d 1547, 1558 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986).

DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

- 20. Any evidence of any discussion about, or advice concerning, any plea bargain or requested benefit between the State and any prospective witness. *United States v. Kojayan*, 8 F.3d 1315 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993)(conviction reversed and case remanded to consider dismissal as sanction for government's failure to disclose deal between witness and government, which witness government chose not to call at trial); *Haber v. Wainwright*, 756 F.2d 1520, 1523-24 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985) (government "advice" to witness must be disclosed); *Campbell v. Reid*, 594 F.2d 4, 7 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979) (prosecutor's statement to the witness that he "would do the right thing" must disclosed to the defense even if the witness is unaware of its exact meaning); *Dubose v. Lefevre*, 619 F.2d 973, 978- 79 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1980) (same).
- 21. The full scope of any witness' past cooperation with the State including but not limited to all monies, benefits and promises received in exchange for cooperation. *United States v. Shafer*, 789 F.2d 682-688-89 and n. 7 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988)); *United States v. Eduardo-Franco*, 885 F.2d 1002, 1010 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1989) (evidence of past services highly relevant to bias and interest).
- 22. All statements of any prospective witness relevant to his testimony or relevant to impeachment or bias. *See Kyles v. Whitely*, 115 S.Ct. 1555, 1569 (1995)(reversible error not to disclose evidence of misidentification by crucial witness); *United States v. Brumel-Alvarez*, 991 F.2d 1452 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) (informant's recantation of earlier statement to D.E.A. had to be disclosed as Jencks Act as it bore on credibility); *United States v. Tincher*, 907 F.2d 600 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) (reversible error for prosecutor to withhold grand jury testimony of witness that contradicted his trial testimony).
- 23. Any evidence that any prospective witness has made an inconsistent statement to the State or any of its agents with respect to his proposed testimony. *See Kyles v. Whitely*, 115 S.Ct. at 1569 (reversible error not to disclose evidence of misidentification by crucial witness); *United States v. Isgro*, 974 F.2d 1091 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) (gross misconduct where DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

prosecutor to failed to disclose prior grand jury testimony of witness which was inconsistent with his trial testimony); *McDowell v. Dixon*, 858 F.2d 945, 949 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 109 S.Ct. 1172 (1989) (reversible error to withhold victim's prior inconsistent statement to police about description of attacker); *Chavis v. North Carolina*, 637 F.2d 213, 223 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980) (contradictory statements of witness must be disclosed); *Powell v. Wiman*, 287 F.2d 275, 279-80 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1961)(same).

- 24. Any evidence that any prospective State witness has made a statement inconsistent with or contradictory to any statement by any other person whether or not a prospective witness. See United States v. Minsky, 963 F.2d 870, 874-77 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992)(error not to disclose witness's statement to F.B.I. contradicted by third party); Hudson v. Blackburn, 601 F.2d 785, 789 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979)(statement of police officer refuting witness' statement that he identified defendant at lineup); United States v. Hibler, 463 F.2d 455, 460 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1972) (statement of police officer casting doubt on story of witness); Hudson v. Whitley, 979 F.2d 1058 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) (statement of witness identifying another person as killer).
- 25. Any evidence that a witness has engaged in crimes even though he has not been formally charged or convicted of those crimes. See *United States v. Osorio*, 929 F.2d 753 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1991) (prosecutor "using a witness with an impeachable past has a constitutionally derived duty to search for and produce impeachment information requested regarding the witness"); *Powell v. Wiman*, 287 F.2d 275, 279- 80 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.1961) (admission of witness to prosecutor that he engaged in several crimes should have been disclosed); *United States v. Boffa*, 513 F. Supp. 444 (D.C. Del. 1980) (prior bad acts of witness discoverable); *United States v. Burnside*, 824 F. Supp. 1215 (N.D. III. 1993) (reversible error not to disclose ongoing illegal drug use by cooperating witnesses). *See also United States v. Ray*, 731 F.2d 1361 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984) (criminal conduct occurring after execution of plea agreement constitutes evidence of bias or motive).

26. Any evidence that any prospective State witness has ever made any false statement to law enforcement authorities regarding any matter. *United States v. Bernal-Obeso*, 989 F.2d 331, 337 (9<sup>th</sup> 1993)(informant's lie to DEA about his criminal record); *United States v. Brumel-Alvarez*, 991 F.2d at 1465 (D.E.A. agent's opinion of informant credibility); *United States v. Dimas*, 3 F.3d 1015, 1018 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (evidence that DEA agent faced disciplinary proceedings for having backdated report); *United States v. Strifler*, 851 F.2d 1197, 1202 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) (probation file listing instances of the witness lying to authorities).

- 27. Any evidence that any witness has a tendency to lie or exaggerate his testimony. Brumel- Alvarez, 991 F.2d at 1465 (D.E.A. agent's negative view of informant's credibility); United States v. Strifler, 851 F.2d at 1202 (must disclose probation file of witness showing tendency to lie or over- compensate).
- 28. Any evidence that any prospective witness has consumed alcohol or drugs prior to witnessing or participating in the events that gave rise to his testimony or any time prior to testifying in court. See United States v. Butler, 481 F.2d 531, 534-535 (D.C. Cir. 1973) (drug use impairs memory, judgment, and credibility); Burnside, 824 F. Supp. at 1215 (reversible error to fail to disclose witnesses drug use because "illegal drug use by the cooperating wetness was relevant to the witnesses' abilities to recollect and relate events...and clear inducements from which a factfinder could infer witnesses wanted to stay on government prosecutor's good side").
- 29. Any medical, psychological or psychiatric evidence tending to show that any prospective witness's ability to perceive, remember, communicate, or tell the truth is impaired. See United States v. Lindstrom, 698 F.2d 1154, 1163-68 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) (psychiatric records relevant to credibility); Chavis v. North Carolina, 637 F.2dat 224 (psychiatric records reflecting on the competency or credibility of witness); Butler, 481 F.2d at 534-535 (drug use); United States v. McFarland, 371 F.2d 701, 705 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir.) (prior hospitalizations of witness for mental DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

illness), cert. denied, 387 U.S. 906 (1966). Powell v. Wiman, 287 F.2d 275, 279 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1961) (same).

- 30. Any evidence that a prospective State witness is biased or prejudiced against the defendant or has a motive to falsify or distort his or her testimony, including but not limited to the plans or intent of any prospective State witness to file a civil lawsuit for damages against the defendant.. See Strifler, 851 F.2d at 1202 (motive to inform discoverable).
- 31. Any impeaching or bad character evidence relating to any witness. *United States v. Becerra*, 992 F.2d 960 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993).
- 32. Any evidence that a prospective State witness has not passed a polygraph examination or had inconclusive results. *See Carter v. Rafferty*, 826 F.2d 1299, 1305 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1011 (1988); *United States v. Lynn*, 856 F.2d 430, 432-33 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1988).
- 33. The full scope of any witness' association or affiliation with the State and its agencies, including local law enforcement agencies and SCF
- 34. Any evidence that the State or its agents view or have ever viewed any potential State witness as not truthful. *United States v. Brumel-Alvarez*, 991 F.3d 1452 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).
- 35. Any physical evidence, medical records, counseling records, or other documents tending to exculpate the defendant in whole or in part, tending to mitigate punishment, or tending to impeach a State witness. *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) (accomplice statement that he, not defendant was actual shooter mitigates punishment of defendant); *see also Miller v. Pate*, 386 U.S. 1 (1967) (reversible error not to disclose evidence that clothing was covered with paint, not blood); *United States v. Wood*, 57 F.3d 733 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) (government had duty to disclose results of company research which would have been useful in impeaching government witnesses); *Ballinger v. Kerby*, 3 F.3d 1371, 1376 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (due process violated by failure to produce possibly impeaching photos of crime scene which DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY

would have buttressed defense that witness could not have seen out of windows in order to identify defendant); *United States v. Alzate*, 47 F.3d 1103 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995)(new trial granted where prosecutor failed to correct his misstatement of fact which prejudiced defendant); *United States v. Poole*, 379 F.2d 648 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1967) (medical exam showing no evidence of sexual assault).

- 36. The commencement and termination date of the grand jury that indicted the defendant. *In Re Grand Jury*, 903 F.2d 180 (3d Cir. 1990).
- 37. The testimony of any grand jury witness, once that witness has testified on direct at trial. *State v. Hartfield*, 290 Or 583 (1981)(Tape recording of grand jury witness testimony must be disclosed after witness testifies on direct for the

1	Ctata): OBC 122 220 (Crond jurar may h	a severelled to testify for numbers of determining
2	State); ORS 132.220 (Grand juror may be compelled to testify for purpose of determining whether witness' grand jury testimony was consistent with trial testimony).	
3	whether withess grand jury testimony was	consistent with that testimony).
4	DATED this day of	, 2004.
5		
6		
7		TERRI WOOD, OSB # ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14 15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED DISCOVERY	

PAGE 10