## Miller, Robert

Testimony of Joyce Gilchrist

is that right? 1 Yes, sir. 2 And in fact he needed a ride. He told you that. A 3 ride was provided. He voluntarily came back to the station the following Monday; is that correct? 5 That's correct. So, he complied with every single request that you or 7 Flowers made of him in your contact with him, didn't he? Α I believe so, yes. 9 When you took the hairs, you were trying to take a 10 sufficient sample of hairs from Robert Miller to compare with 11 hairs that might have been found at the scene of the crime; 12 is that right? 13 That's correct. 14 How many hairs initially did you take from Robert? 15 On Saturday the 21st I don't recall. I think I 16 attempted to pull somewhere in the neighborhood of 20, 25, 17 something like that, hairs. I'm not sure exactly how many. 18 MR. EVANS: Pass the witness. 19 THE COURT: Further direct? 20 MR. MACY: No redirect, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. You may stand down. 22 Call your next. 23 JOYCE A. GILCHRIST, 24

called as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2 3 BY MR. ELLIOTT: State your full name, please. My name is Joyce A. Gilchrist. 5 6 How are you employed? I'm a forensic chemist with the Oklahoma City Police 7 Department. 8 And how long have you been so employed? 9 For eight years. 10 Can you tell us briefly what are your duties and 11 responsibilities as a forensic chemist for the police 12 department? 13 I analyze the evidence that is submitted to our lab in 14 reference to cases of rapes and homicides. 15 16 THE COURT: Miss Gilchrist, could you kind of face toward Mr. Elliott and toward us a little more so the 17 court reporter can catch things a little better? 18 Rapes and homicides, hit and runs, manslaughters, 19 indecent liberties, and that sort of thing. 20 21 (By Mr. Elliott) Okay. And can you relate what your educational background and training is for us, please? 22 A Yes, I can. 23 I have a bachelor of science in forensic 24 25 science from Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma,

2

and I've attended a number of professional schools since my employment at the police department.

3

4

5

6

7

8

J

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've attended the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia, where I received training in basic forensic serology, the examination and identification of hairs, fibers, and other types of textile materials. And I also attended an international symposium on forensic hair comparisons held at Quantico, Virginia. I've attended Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where I received training in the human allotype -- human allotyping immunoglobulin techniques taught by Dr. Moses Schanfield. I received training at our OCPD forensic laboratory in the isoelectric focusing techniques of detecting genetic polymorphisms. I've attended the Serological Research Institute in Emeryville, California, where I received training in the advanced electrophoretic techniques of bloodstain analysis in forensic serology, the electrophoretic techniques of semen analysis in forensic serology. I've attended the Southwest Homicide Investigative Seminar held in Norman, Oklahoma, and Oklahoma City, and I've also been an instructor at those same seminars. attended the Central U.S. Police Institute here in Oklahoma City where I received training in the geometric interpretation of bloodstains and their flight patterns. conducted my forensic science practicum at the Oklahoma City Police Department. And I've been certified by the Council on

- law enforcement, education, and training as a police instructor for the State of Oklahoma.
- During your course of employment with the Oklahoma

  City Police Department as a forensic chemist, have you had an occasion to withdraw or to draw, I should say maybe, bloodstains from individuals in reference to particular cases?
  - A I have.

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Approximately how many times?
- 10 A Hundreds of times.
- 11 Q Okay. Could you give us a brief description of the
  12 manner and technique in which you do these?
  - A Of drawing samples, collecting samples?
  - Q Of blood samples.
- 15 A Of blood samples.

I received my training, first of all, from University Hospital, and so I'm a certified phlebotomist.

I tell the person what I'm going to do first, prior to doing that. I lay my utensils on the table beside that individual. It will be a vacutainer needle plus a vacutainer tube, the -- I can't think if it now -- the tubing or the tie I use around the arm, alcohol swabs and cotton. And then I proceed to examine both arms to determine which arm would be most suitable for drawing a sample of blood from. And I ask them to hold their arm our straight, make a

fist, and then I apply the tourniquet, clean the area, and then go ahead and draw the blood, and later submit it to our laboratory, Also in your course of employment with the Oklahoma City Police Department as a forensic chemist, have you had an occasion to take saliva samples from individuals? I have. Approximately how many times? Again, hundreds of times. 

Q Okay. Again, would you tell us briefly the procedures you go through in doing that?

A We use a clean piece of filter paper that's been stamped on the end that tells us not to handle it beyond a certain point. I will turn the filter paper toward the individual, explain to them that I want them to drop a sample of saliva onto the filter paper approximately the size of a nickle. Now, I'm just asking them to spit onto the paper, and they do so, and I sit it over to the side so it can air dry and I proceed to collect other samples.

I want to direct your attention back to February the 23rd of 1987 and ask if you were employed by the Oklahoma City Police Department at that time and on duty.

A I was.

Q Did you have an occasion to come in contact with a person identified to you by the name of Robert Lee Miller?

1	A I did.
2	Q And do you see him in the courtroom today?
3	A I do.
4	Q Would you point him out, tell us where he's seated and
5	briefly how he's dressed?
6	A He's a black man sitting at the defense table. He's
7	in an aqua colored shirt, short sleeve shirt.
8	MR. ELLIOTT: May the record reflect she's
9	identified the defendant?
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	Q (By Mr. Elliott) For what reason did you come in
12	contact with Mr. Miller on that day?
13	A I was informed by the detectives that he had signed a
14	waiver to give up body samples and they wanted me to draw a
15	sample of blood and get a saliva sample from him.
16	Q Okay. And did you do that?
17	A I did.
18	Q And did you follow the techniques in which you briefly
19	described for the jury?
20	A I did.
21	MR. ELLIOTT: May I approach the witness, Your
22	Honor?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	Q (By Mr. Elliott) I hand you what's been marked for
25	identification purposes as State's Exhibits 49 and 50 and

1	ask you to examine those, please.
2	A I have.
3	Q Can you tell me what those are?
4	A I can.
5	Q Okay. What are they?
6	A State's Exhibit Number 49 is an empty vial. At one
7	time it contained a liquid blood sample obtained from Robert
8	Lee Miller.
9	State's Exhibit 50 is a white envelope
10	containing a saliva sample obtained from Robert Lee Miller.
11	Q How do you know those are the ones you obtained from
12	Robert Lee Miller?
13	A Because my initials and case number and item numbers
14	are on these items.
15	Q What did you do with those items after you obtained
16	the samples from Mr. Miller?
17	A I submitted them to our laboratory.
18	Q In what condition?
19	A In a sealed and closed condition.
20	MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions at this
21	time, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: You may cross-examine.
23	MR. EVANS: I have no questions of Miss
24	Gilchrist at this time, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: At this time.

1	All right. Thank you.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: You may stand down.
4	Call your next.
5	MR. MACY: Yes, sir.
6	May it please the Court.
7	LARRY BALDING,
8	called as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma,
9	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. MACY:
12	Q State your name, please, sir.
13	A My name is Larry Balding.
14	Q What is your occupation or profession, sir?
15	A I'm employed as a medical doctor specializing in
16	forensic pathology by the Office of the Chief Medical
17	Examiner here in Oklahoma City.
18	Q What is your official position there, sir?
19	A My official position is a deputy medical examiner.
20	THE COURT: Is what?
21	THE WITNESS: A deputy medical examiner.
22	Q (By Mr. Macy) What is your educational or
23	professional background, Doctor?
24	MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I would offer a
25	stipulation at this time that Dr. Balding is an eminently

1 JOYCE A. GILCHRIST. recalled as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 3 having been previously sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. ELLIOTT: 6 Q Would you state your name for the record, please? 7 My name is Joyce A. Gilchrist. 8 And you're the same Joyce Gilchrist who testified here 9 yesterday? 10 I am. 11 I'm going to ask you if in -- or have as 12 responsibilities in the course of your employment as a 13 forensic chemist for the Oklahoma City Police Department if 14 you received evidence in reference to an attempted burglary 15 of 16 Α I did. 17 And can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury 18 what you received? 19 Well, I actually submitted the evidence myself. 20 submitted a swabbing of bloodstain taken from a door at the 21 residence of 3308 North Lake. 22 MR. ELLIOTT: May I approach the witness, Your 23 Honor? 24 THE COURT: Yes. 25

Get her name in the record, please.

- Q (By Mr. Elliott) I hand you what's been introduced into evidence as State's Exhibit 112 and ask you to look at that, please. Can you tell me what that is?
  - A It's a photograph of the door, some prints on it.
  - Q Now, I'll hand you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 114 and ask you if you can identify that.
  - A I can.

6

7

8

15

- 9 | Q And what is 114?
- 10 A State's Exhibit 114 is an evidence envelope containing
  11 swabbings of bloodstains taken from a door.
- 12 Q From the door that's depicted in State's Exhibit ~ 13 Number 112?
- 14 A Pardon me?
  - Q From the door exhibited in State's Exhibit 112?
- 16 A That's correct.
- 17 | Q Now, what did you do after you removed the bloodstain 18 | swab from the door?
  - A I submitted them directly to our laboratory.
- 20 Q And then at some later date did you perform any tests
  21 or analyses?
- 22 | A I did.
- 23 | Q Could you tell us what you did, please?
- 24 A Yes. I submitted the swabbings to a test we call
  25 electrophoresis and also ABO typing to determine the blood

1	type of the stain taken from the door.
2	Q Okay. Were you able to determine the ABO blood type
3	of the blood removed from the door?
4	A I was.
5	Q And what was that?
6	A It was type "A."
7	Q Were you able to arrive at any other results as a
8	result of the electrophoresis exam?
9	A No, I wasn't. My results were negative.
10	Q And do you have an explanation for that?
11	A The stain wasn't concentrated enough.
12	MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions.
13	Well, at this time, Your Honor, we move to
14	introduce State's Exhibit 114.
15	THE COURT: Any objection?
16	MR. EVANS: No, sir.
17	THE COURT: It's admitted.
18	MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions, Judge.
19	THE COURT: You may cross-examine.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. EVANS:
22	Q Miss Gilchrist, educate me as to one aspect of the
23	bloodstain that you typed and you found out that it was "A."
24	Now, you could tell whether the blood came from an "A" person
25	whether or not that person was a secretor or not; is that

right? 1 2 No. it's not correct. 3 Okay. So, we know the person who donated that blood is a secretor; right? I don't know that. 5 6 You don't know whether he's a secretor or not from your test on the blood. 7 That's correct. 8 Α Okay. Let me back up then. 9 If you took a sample of my blood, regardless of 10 11 the fact whether or not I was a secretor, whether I secreted my blood type in my other secretions, my tears, my saliva, 12 you could take my blood and test my blood type; is that 13 right? 14 That's correct. Mr. Evans, secretor status is a 15 totally different test. It's not -- it's associated with 16 blood types, but it's not -- you don't determine that from 17 18 doing a blood typing examination. Okay? That's a totally different test in itself, independent of blood typing. 19 All right. Miss Gilchrist, where I'm going is from 20 the results, the analyses you did on this stain on the door 21 of Miss house, all we can tell is that the person 22

That's correct because it was a dried stain. When I

determine secretor status on a blood sample, it has to be

who donated it is "A" type: is that right?

23

24

1 Tell the jury and Court, if you would, how 2 many -- the percentage of the black male population are "A." 3 Percentage of the black population who has type "A" is approximately 26 percent. And if you assume at least half 5 the population are male, that reduces it down to 13 percent 6 approximately. 7 Okay. 8 MR. EVANS: No further questions. 9 THE COURT: The State? Anything further? 10 No. Your Honor, not at this time. MR. ELLIOTT: 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 THE VITNESS: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: You may stand down. 14 Call your next, State. 15 MR. MACY: May we approach, Your Honor? 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 (At this time a brief off-the-record discussion was 18 had outside the hearing of the jury.) 19 THE COURT: Members of the jury, we'll take a 20 little earlier recess than normally we would, and I'll 21 explain why. As I told you earlier, the State obviously is 22 dividing its proof as to the three separate incidents that 23 are charged in this case. The State has now completed its 24 evidence as to the second incident, we'll call it. The

in a liquid state.

next one will be the third one that you heard testimony 1 about, some at least before. Rather than put the first 2 3 witness on whose testimony we'd have to interrupt sometime in the middle of it, we'll just recess now. It's not that much 4 5 earlier than noon anyway. I'll ask you to be back before 1:30 in the jury room. 7 You may, again, remain in there if you care to, go to lunch and come back. Whatever you care to do. But be 8 back up there a little before 1:30. 9 We'll excuse the defendant now. 10 (The defendant exited the courtroom at this time.) 11 THE COURT: Remember that you must not discuss 12 the case during the lunch recess at all with anyone, nor 13 permit anyone to discuss it with you. 14 15 Please be back in the jury room by 1:30. You may be excused until then. 16 (Whereupon, said lunch recess was had, after which the 17 following transpired in open court:) 18 THE COURT: We'll continue. 19 The State may call its next. 20 21 MR. MACY: May it please the Court. 22 GRAHAM M. ROBERTSON, called as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 23 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25

1	on that heater prior to the time that you did your
2	investigation?
3	A No, sir.
4	In many homes the electricity affects the thermostat.
5	In that home with the electricity being on or off have any
6	effect on those type of gas heaters?
7	A No, sir.
8	MR. MACY: No further questions.
9	Your witness.
10	THE COURT: You may cross-examine.
11	MR. EVANS: Not based on that, no, sir.
12	THE COURT: Thank you. That's all.
13	Call your next.
14	MR. MACY: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: You've been sworn and you're still
16	testifying under oath.
17	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	JOYCE A. GILCHRIST,
19	recalled as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma,
20	having been previously sworn, testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. ELLIOTT:
23	Q State your full name again for the record, please.
24	A My name is Joyce A. Gilchrist.
25	Q And you're the same Joyce Gilchrist that's testified

I believe two times earlier in this case. 1 I am. Now, I'd like to ask you at this point in reference --3 in reference to the 4 homicide. 5 Okay. In your capacity as a forensic chemist with the Oklahoma City Police Department, did you receive 6 items of evidence in reference to the homicide of 8 9 I did. Would you for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury and 10 the Court tell us what items you received? 11 Okay. The following evidence was submitted on 1-12-87 12 by Specialist C. Goforth. These items were obtained form 13 1142 Northwest 31 Street, Oklahoma City: Hairs taken from 14 top of bed, eight inches north of the victim's neck; hair 15 from bottom pillow, one foot south of the victim's head; 16 hairs from throat area of victim; one broken finger or 17 toenail on top of bed, one foot two inches south of victim's 18 left leg; one black sock; one knotted white pillow case; one 19 small pillow; two white pillows from under the victim's head; 20 21 one flat white sheet. 22 The following evidence was submitted on 1-13-87 by Specialist Kent Harville. These items were obtained from 23

vaginal fornix swabs; two vaginal cervix swabs; two rectal

One vial of blood; two oral swabs; four

24

swabs; fingernail clippings, left hand; fingernail clippings from the right hand; scalp hairs; pubic hair combing; pubic hairs; one nightgown; one brown paper sack from left hand; one brown paper sack from right hand; one hair clip; one flat top sheet from Amcare; one flat body sheet from Amcare; one paper morgue sheet.

The following evidence was submitted on 1-13-87 by Specialist C. Goforth. This item was obtained from 1142 Northwest 31st Street in Oklahoma City: Eight pieces of wood from the west door and window framing.

The following evidence was submitted on 1-20-87 by Forensic Chemist Thomas C. Kupiec. These items were obtained from a Ra-Heru Khepra, also known as Roderick Wilson: One vial of blood; saliva sample; scalp hairs from the left side of head; scalp hairs, top of head; scalp hairs, back of head; scalp hair from the right side of the head; beard hairs; chest hairs; left arm hairs; right arm hairs; pubic hairs; left leg hairs; right leg hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 1-28-87 by Detective Jerry Flowers. These items were obtained from Jesse McDonald, Jr.: One small tube of blood and dried stain; scalp hairs from top of head; scalp hairs from back of head; scalp hairs from left side of head; scalp hairs from right side of head; left arm hairs; right arm hairs; pubic hairs; left leg hairs; and right leg hairs.

•

The following evidence was submitted on 1-29-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist, and these items were obtained from Ernest E. McDonald: One vial of blood; scalp hairs; a saliva sample; scalp hairs; and pubic hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-2-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from Myrle Blunt: One vial of blood; saliva sample.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-4-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from a Mengesha Tamrat: One vial of blood; saliva sample; scalp hairs; and pubic hairs.

Also, one vial of blood from Johnny Cook, and one vial of blood from Melvin Nickelberry.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-6-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from Leslie Filson: One vial of blood; saliva sample; scalp hairs.

Also one vial of blood from Terry Barkus; one vial of blood from J. C. Jones.

And these items were obtained from Michael J. Adams: one vial of blood; saliva sample; scalp hairs; and pubic hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-9-87 by Detective Jerry Flowers. These items were obtained from a Lynn Amous: Scalp hairs from top of head; scalp hairs from

left side of head; scalp hairs from right side of head; pubic hairs; and one vial of blood.

These items were obtained from Lawrence

Forbes: One small tube of blood; saliva samples; scalp hairs

from top of head; scalp hairs from back of head; scalp hairs

from the left side of the head; scalp hairs from right side

of the head; pubic hairs; right leg hairs; left leg hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-12-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist: One vial of blood from Ira Moore, Jr.; one vial of blood from David Burch, Jr.; and one vial of blood from Joe E. Dawson, Jr.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-20-87 by Detective Jerry Flowers and Forensic Chemist Janice
Davis. These items were obtained from Darrell Taylor: One vial of blood; saliva sample; scalp hair from top of head; scalp from left side of head; scalp hair from right side of head; pubic hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-23 by Detectives Bill Citty and Jerry Flowers and Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from Robert Lee Miller, Jr.: One vial of blood; saliva sample; facial hairs; scalp hair; scalp hair combing; pubic hairs; left leg hairs; and right leg hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-24-87 by Detective Jerry Flowers and Forensic Chemist Janice Davis.

Again these items were obtained from Robert Lee Miller, Jr.: Scalp hairs; facial hairs; pubic hairs; and thigh hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-24-87 by Detective Randy Scott. These items were obtained from three dogs located at 911 Northwest 32nd Street, Oklahoma City: Hairs taken from a seven-month old rottweiler named Dumpling; hairs taken from a ten-month old rottweiler/airedale named Little Bit; and hairs taken from a three-month old rottweiler named Bear.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-24-87 by Detective Jerry Flowers and Forensic Chemist Janice Davis. These items were obtained from a Clem Jeffries: One vial of blood; saliva samples; scalp hairs; facial hairs; and public hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-25-87 by Detective Randy Scott. These items were obtained from 802 Northwest 25th Street, Apartment B, Oklahoma City: One black leather holster with one valor knife; and one blue coat.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-26-87 by Detective Bill Citty. These items were obtained from Robert Lee Miller, Jr.: One black ball cap; one black and white knitted cap; one pair of jockey shorts; one long-sleeved shirt; one pair of blue jeans; one hooded jacket; one leather belt; one pair of cloth gloves; one folding knife with white handle.

.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-27-87 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from a Walter D. Stephens: One vial of blood; one saliva sample; scalp hairs; facial hairs; pubic hairs; and leg hairs.

The following evidence was submitted on 2-18-88 by Forensic Chemist Joyce Gilchrist. These items were obtained from Robert Lee Miller, Jr.: Fingernail clippings from left hand; fingernail clippings from right hand; toenail clippings from left foot; toenail clippings from right foot.

Okay. Does that include the list of all the evidence you received in your capacity as a forensic chemist for the Oklahoma City Police Department in reference to Zelma Cutler homicide case?

A It does.

Q Did you perform any forensic tests, either serological or hair comparisons, on any or all of these items?

A I did.

MR. ELLIOTT: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Q (By Mr. Elliott) I'll now hand you what's marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit Number 85 and ask you to look at it, please. Can you tell me what 85 is?

A 85, State's Exhibit 85 is an evidence envelope

containing trace evidence that was obtained from 1142 1 Northwest 31st Street. 2 3 Okay. How do you recognize State's 85? Because it has my initials on it and my case number 5 and my laboratory item number. Q Okay. What condition was State's 85 when you received 7 1t? It was in a closed and sealed condition. 8 9 And I'll ask you now to open State's Exhibit 85 and examine the contents, please. Ask you to examine State's 85A 10 through D and ask if you can recognize those, please. 11 Okay. 85A is a bindle that contained hairs taken from 12 the top of the bed of the victim, by the victim's neck. 13 85B are hairs taken from the bottom pillow one 14 foot south of the victim's head. 15 16 85C are hairs taken from the throat area of the victim. 17 18 85D is a broken finger or toenail which was found on top of the bed one foot two inches south of the left 19 leg of the victim. 20 21 And what were the conditions of State's Exhibit 85A through D when you received them? 22 23 They were in a sealed and closed condition.

Were they located inside State's 85?

Yes, they were.

I'll now hand you what's marked as State's Exhibit 86 1 and ask you to examine it, please. Can you tell me what 2 State's 86 is? 3 Yes, I can. It's a brown paper sack containing a 4 white knotted pillow case. 5 How do you recognize State's 86? 6 Has my initials and case number and laboratory item 7 number on the back. 8 And what condition was State's 86 when you 9 received it? 10 In a sealed, closed condition. 11 Now, I hand you what's marked as State's Exhibit 87. 12 and ask if you recognize State's 87. 13 I can. 14 And how do you recognize State's 87? 15 Again, my initials, case number, and laboratory item 16 number is on the back. 17 And what is State's 87? 18 Two white pillows taken from under the victim's head. 19 And what condition was State's 87 when you received 20 it? 21 Sealed and closed condition. 22

I'll hand you what's marked as State's Exhibit 88.

ask you to examine it, please. Do you recognize State's 88?

23

24

25

I do.

And how do you recognize it? 1 2 Again, my initials and case number and lab item number is on the back. 3 Okay. What condition was State's 88 when you received 5 it? Α Sealed and closed condition. 7 Q And what is State's 88? One flat white sheet. 8 Now, I hand you State's 89 and ask you to look at it, please. Ask if you recognize State's 89. 10 11 I do. 12 How do you recognize it? Again, it has my initials, my case number, laboratory 13 item numbers on it. And what is State's 89? 15 16 State's 89, exhibit, is an evidence envelope containing morgue evidence obtained from 17 18 And what condition was State's 89 when you received 1t? 19 In a sealed and closed condition. 20 At this time I'd ask you to open State's 89 and 21 examine the contents, State's 89A through E. 22 23 A through E?

I believe that's correct.

I have A through F here.

24

1	Q I'm sorry. You're correct. A through F.
2	A Okay. 89A is an empty vial that at one time contained
3	a liquid blood sample obtained from and also a
4	dried stain that I made of her blood sample myself in the
5	laboratory.
6	89B, the evidence envelope that at one time
7	contained four vaginal fornix swabs from
8	89C is an envelope that at one time contained
9	two vaginal cervix swabs from
10	89D is an envelope that at one time contained
11	two rectal swabs obtained from
12	89E, an envelope that contained fingernail
13	clippings from the left hand of
14	And 89F, an envelope that contained the
15	fingernail clippings from the right hand of
16	Q Again, how do you recognize State's 89A through F?
17	A Again, my initials and my laboratory item and case
18	number on each item.
19	Q What were the conditions of Items 89A through F when
20	you received them?
21	A In a sealed and closed condition.
22	Q And were they contained in State's 89?
23	A Pardon me?
24	Q And were they contained in State's 89?
25	A They were.

```
I'll hand you what's marked as State's Exhibit 90 and
 1
 2
    ask you to examine it, please. Can you tell me what that is?
 3
    A
            Yes, I can.
 4
            And what is it?
 5
            It's a nightgown taken from the body of
 6
    Q
            And how do you recognize it?
 7
           Again, it has my initials, the case number, and item
 8
    number on it.
    Q
            And what condition was it when you received it?
 9
           Sealed and closed condition.
10
           I now hand you State's Exhibit 91 and ask you to
11
    examine it. Can you tell me what that is?
12
13
           I can.
14
           And what is it?
15
           It's one flat top sheet from Amcare.
16
           And how do you recognize it?
17
           Again, my name, my initials, and item number is on the
18
    back.
           And what condition was State's 91 when you received
19
    it?
20
21
           Sealed and closed condition.
```

I can.

What is it?

examine that and tell us what it is.

22

23

24

25

I hand you State's Exhibit 92 and ask if you can

It's a body sheet from Amcare that was used to 1 transport the body of 2 And what condition was it when you received it? 3 Sealed and closed condition. And how do you recognize that? 5 Again, my initials, case number, laboratory item 6 number are on the back. 7 I'll hand you what's marked as State's Exhibits 93 and 8 94 and ask you to examine those, please. Can you tell me 9 what those are? 10 I can. 11 93 are hairs taken from Robert Lee Miller. 12 And how do you recognize? 13 Again, my initials, my case number, and laboratory 14 item number on them. 15 Okay. Referring to State's 94. 16 94 are -- is a scalp hair combing obtained from Robert 17 Lee Miller. 18 And how do you recognize it? 19 My initials, case number, laboratory item number. 20 And what were the conditions of State's 93, 94 when you received them? 22 They had been opened previously by Janice Davis, but 23 she had stapled them.

I hand you what's marked as State's 95 and 96 and

G)

- ask you to examine those, please. Can you tell me what those are?
  - A Yes, I can.

7

- 4 Q What are those?
- 5 A 95 is a reference scalp hair sample taken from Robert 6 Lee Miller.
  - 96 are reference dog hairs taken from a rottweiler named Bear.
- 9 Q How do you recognize State's 95?
- 10 A 95 has my initials, case number, and laboratory item
  11 number.
- 12 Q And what condition was State's 95 when you received 13 it?
- A Again, it had been previously opened by Janice Davis, but she had stapled it.
- 16 Q Okay. How do you recognize State's 96?
- A Again, my initials and laboratory number and item number.
- 19 Q And what condition was State's 96 when you received 20 it?
- 21 A It was in a sealed and closed condition.
- Q I now hand you State's Exhibit 97 and ask you to examine it, please. Can you tell me what it is?
- 24 A I can.
- 25 State's Exhibit 97 contains two items: One

black ball cap and one black and white knitted cap obtained 1 from Robert Lee Miller. How do you recognize that? 3 Again, my initials, case number, laboratory item number is on the back. 5 And what condition was it when you received it? 6 Sealed and closed condition. I hand you what's marked as State's Exhibits 98, 99, 8 and 100, and ask you to look at those, please. Can you tell 9 me what those are? 10 I can. 11 And what are those? 12 98 are fingernail clippings taken from the left hand 13 of Robert Lee Miller. 14 99 are fingernail clippings taken from the 15 right hand of Robert Lee Miller. 16 And State's Exhibit 100 is a dried stain of 17 liquid blood of Robert Lee Miller that I made in my 18 laboratory. 19 And how do you recognize State's 98, 99, and 100? 20 Again, they both -- all bear my initials and my case 21 number and laboratory item numbers on them. 22 In reference to State's Exhibits 98 and 99, do you 23 have knowledge as to who recovered those fingernail

clippings?

Λ I did myself. 1 From whom? 2 3 A Robert Lee Miller. Q And do you see him in the courtroom today? 5 A I do. 6 Would you point him out and tell us where he's seated? The black man seated at the table in the multi-colored 7 shirt. 8 MR. ELLIOTT: May the record reflect she's. 9 10 identified the defendant? 11 THE COURT: Yes. (Hy Mr. Elliott) The fingernail clipping exhibit 12 there that are contained in State's 98 and 99 that were 13 recovered from the defendant, was that done pursuant to a 14 court order? 15 16 It was. 17 And where did you do that? In the Oklahoma County Jail. 18 In this building? 19 In this building. 20 21 Now, in reference to State's 100, you said something about a bloodstain that you prepared. Can you explain that 22 just briefly? 23 Well, it's routine procedure in our laboratory to make 24

a dried stain and also to freeze a small aliquot of every

liquid blood that comes into our laboratory, we keep in our 1 freezer. And this is a routine procedure. So, in case we need to go back to re-examine something, we'll have something 3 to use. And what condition did you -- or strike that. 5 What did you do with the fingernail clippings 6 that you removed from Robert Lee Miller, Jr., after you 7 removed them in the Oklahoma County Jail? 8 I took them to our laboratory and submitted them to 9 our lab. 10 In? 11 In a sealed and closed condition. 12 Okay. And did you perform analyses, tests, and form 13 conclusions on each of the items that I just had you 14 identify? 15 With the exceptions of Item Numbers 98 and 99, yes, I 16 did. 17 And to your knowledge what was done, if anything, to 18 98 and 99? What did you do? I sent them to a Dr. I. C. Stone in Dallas. 20 MR. ELLIOTT: Judge, at this time I would move 21 to introduce -- and bear with me because some of these have 22 already been introduced. I move to introduce State's Exhibit 23

96, which may have already been introduced yesterday

afternoon, I believe.

1	THE COURT: I think it was, but all right.
2	It's admitted.
3	MR. BLLIOTT: Show that 85 and 85A through D
4	have previously been admitted.
5	THE COURT: Perhaps they were not. They are
6	admitted.
7	MR. ELLIOTT: 86.
8	THE COURT: What's the next one?
9	MR. ELLIOTT: I move to admit well, Judge, I
10	show 93 and 94 have been introduced and admitted too. Is
11	that correct?
12	THE COURT: What did you say about 86?
13	MR. ELLIOTT: I show that 86 has already been
14	admitted, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: I don't show it, but you move its
16	admission?
17	MR. ELLIOTT: I would move its admission at
18	this time.
19	THE COURT: Any objection?
20	MR. EVANS: No, sir.
21	THE COURT: It's admitted.
22	MR. ELLIOTT: Same thing as with 87. I show it
23	admitted at the same time. If not, I'll move to admit it
24	now.
25	THE COURT: Any objection?

1	MR. EVANS: No objections.
2	THE COURT: It's admitted.
3	MR. ELLIOTT: Same thing with 88, Your Honor.
4	MR. EVANS: Same announcement.
5	THE COURT: It's admitted.
6	MR. ELLIOTT: Same thing with 89. I show it
7	was introduced yesterday, but if not, I'll move its admission
8	now.
9	THE COURT: Any objection?
10	MR. EVANS: No objection.
11	THE COURT: It's admitted.
12	MR. ELLIOTT: Same with 93 and 94. I show them
13	admitted yesterday, but if not, I move their admission now.
14	THE COURT: Any objection?
15	MR. EVANS: No, sir.
16	THE COURT: They're admitted.
17	MR. ELLIOTT: State's Exhibit 100 I would move
18	its admission at this time.
19	MR. EVANS: No objections.
20	THE COURT: It's admitted.
21	MR. ELLIOTT: And as well as 98 and 99.
22	MR. EVANS: No objections.
23	THE COURT: They're admitted.
24	Q (By Mr. Elliott) Now, if you would, Miss Gilchrist,
25	if you would relate to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury

the tests that you performed and your analyses and conclusions serologically in reference to the items that I just had you identify. If I didn't pronounce that right, I apologize.

A Okay. There were a number of serological exams that I did perform on the evidence submitted in this case, and I'll start out first of all with the evidence obtained from the crime scene.

I will start out with Exhibit Number 87. I had a number of stains on it. I examined it for the presence of trace hairs. Then I examined it for the presence of any stains. Standard procedure in our laboratory is to try to identify what type of stain we have. And if we can identify it as blood or semen or mixed or mixed body fluid, then I will do a test that's called a secretor typing test.

THE COURT: What is 87 for the benefit of the jury?

THE WITNESS: Item Number 87 are two white pillows found under the victim's head.

THE COURT: Okay.

Okay. A secretor typing test is a test that will allow me to identify, hope to identify the blood type of the semen donor in this case, or in any case, if that semen donor is a secretor. Now, from these stains that I have a reaction to as far as the seminal acid phosphatase test goes --

THE COURT: Could you push the microphone a little bit away from you?

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: You're too close.

All right.

A Seminal acid phosphatase, the AP test, is a screening test only indicative of seminal fluid. That was one of the first tests I did on the stains, to try to identify what they were. If I get a -- it's a color reaction test. And if I get a color change, then I will go ahead and make a cutting, make an extract using distilled water. Take a small amount of that extract, place it on a slide, let it air dry, heat fixed stain, and look for sperm microscopically under a thousand power oil immersion. If I identify semen in that particular fashion, then I will go on to do the secretor typing test, which will give me the blood type of the semen donor if that person is a secretor.

Secretors are classified as people whose blood type can be detected in their other body fluids, be their saliva or vaginal fluids, seminal stains, seminal fluid, tears, and sometimes nasal mucous. About 80 percent of the general population are classified as secretors, and 20 percent of the population are classified as those people whose blood types cannot be detected in appreciable quantities using this particular type of assay.

bit?

After I've identified whether or not the semen donor is a secretor or not, then I can also tell what his blood type is from that same test. Then I will go ahead and do a test that we call the electrophoresis. That is an assay in our laboratory that requires the use of electricity applied to a glass plate that has a thin layer of agarose on it.

THE COURT: Could you just slow down just a wee

THE WITNESS: Okay.

A It's likened to a thin layer of jello. It's about that consistency. Maybe a little sturdier.

I smear that across the plate and have an even thickness. I make slots in that plate. I then inject my or place my stain samples inside, in that jello, and I apply certain amount of electricity to that plate for a prescribed period of time. This allows the proteins or bands from these stains to move certain distances across the plate. Now, you can't visualize this with the naked eye, so I have to add overlays of other chemicals to allow me to visualize these bands, protein bands that show up.

Once I've identified those then I can -- I can identify at least three different types of enzymes or genetic markers on a particular plate. And this particular run that I do, I identify Peptidase A, Esterase D, and PGM. After

^

I've identified — if I get PGM activity, I'll do another more sophisticated electrophoresis test called subtyping, PGM-subtyping, which is going to break down the PGM from the initial run into a further degree to allow me to further individualize that particular stain so that I can ascertain as to who that — who could have contributed that particular stain. And I did perform that analysis in this case.

I will also -- you can also do the same thing to -- the same type of assay -- I mean, test to blood and/or semen or vaginal secretions. That was done on the evidence in this case.

So, I can identify genetic markers, blood type, secretor status as far as the individual is concerned in this case.

Q (By Mr. Elliott) Okay. Based on those tests that you've just described to the jury, did you arrive at conclusions concerning evidence you received in this case which you just identified?

A I did.

Okay. Now, I think I got a step ahead of myself.

Now, would you relate those conclusions as they relate to each individual item in this case?

A Okay. I will start again with Item Number 87, Exhibit Number 87, the two white pillows found under the victim's head. One of the pillows had a number of semen stains and

bloodstains on them that I had to cut out to examine.

Item 87, I'll call "A," was one pillow. I identified three different stains -- isolated three different stains on that pillow. There was a bloodstain. I identified it as human blood, and I also detected the "H" antigen, indicative type "O" blood.

Now, on the ABO level there are four different blood types. Okay. There's type "A," type "B," type "O," and type "AB." If a person has type "A" blood, I would expect to identify the "A" in "H" antigens. But you don't always get the "H" antigen. Same thing with type "B." I'd expect to find "B" in "H," but not necessary always the "H." Type "O" blood you can only identify the "H" antigen. In type "AB" blood identify all three, "AB" and "H."

In this instance I identified the "H," which is indicative type "O" blood. This blood type is consistent with the blood type of who in fact is type "O."

On the other two stains, I was not able to identify any semen on them. It wasn't blood and it was not semen. So, I don't know what they were.

On Exhibit 87B I isolated a total of ten stained areas on that pillow. First of all, I identified semen on all but two of those stains. I identified the ABO blood group secretor substance "A." On five of those stains I identified the "A" and "H" blood group secretor

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

Judge?

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

substances. On three of those stains I identified the ABO blood group substance "H" on one of those stains.

I also attempted, as I said, to do electrophoresis on these stained areas. I was able to identify several markers. On one of my Q's I identified PEPA (1), ESD (1), and PGM (1). And I subtyped and identified subtype (1+). These markers are consistent with the markers of the victim. However, that semen could not have come from her. So, that semen is foreign to her, and that "A" antigen is foreign to her also. So, the semen information I'm picking up is coming from the semen donor.

I must also interject that this Q2 was also bloodstain -- mixed with blood.

When you say "Q1" and "2," what are you talking about? Those areas on the --

If I could show you?

MR. ELLIOTT: May I approach the witness,

THE COURT: Yes.

(By Mr. Elliott) I'll hand you State's 87.

Now, this is one of the pillows that was found underneath the victim's head. And the blue marks and red marks are marks -- are circles made by myself. I put numbers by them, and I also have some indication of whether or not my AP test was positive or negative. That gave me an

indication that these stains had semen mixed in with them or maybe they were just plain bloodstain. I circled the items, I cut out the stained areas to allow me to perform my analyses. And I identified which stain this area came from by subscribing numbers to them. I call them Q1 out through Q10, and there may be even Q11 I did subsequently, but that was a bloodstain, I believe, or nothing. I couldn't identify anything on that. So, these Q's are what I'm talking about, these circled areas (indicating).

- Q Okay. So that I understand and the jury understands, you take the entire pillow that has the stain on it, both the front and the back, and then you circle certain areas. You make the Magic Marker marks or the blue ink marks.
- A That's correct.

- And then you cut, actually cut out the spot, and those are the areas that you test. You don't lay the pillow itself underneath the microscope or anything.
- A That's correct. I just test the areas that I cut out.
- Q Okay. You refer to them as "Q1," "Q2," and so forth so that when you say "Q2," you're referring to your question or your cubed spot that you actually cut out of the pillow.
- A That's correct,
- Q Okay. I believe I interrupted you when you were telling your actual analysis of the pillows themselves.
- A Okay. Q2, I identified semen, ABO type "A" blood,

which tells me that the semen donor is a type "A" secretor in 1 this case. However, because there's blood mixed in with the 2 seminal stain, the activity I'm picking up, the information 3 I'm picking up is all coming from the victim. The PGM 4 activity is 50 times higher in blood than it is in seminal 5 fluids. So, I've got a mixed body fluid. I'm getting a 6 masking effect where it's hiding or covering up the information that could have come from the semen donor or the 8 semen in this instance. 9

- And when you're saying "mixed body fluid," do you mean could the blood and semen mix or --
- A I've got blood and semen mixed together.
- Q Two different type fluids that have been secreted from somebody that are mixed together.
- A That's correct.
- Q All right. Go ahead.
  - A My Q3 I did not identify spermatozoa. I got a positive reaction from my acid phosphatase, which indicated seminal fluid, but -- and I identified the "A" blood group substance, but there were no sperm -- seminal fluid but no sperm cells --

THIS REPORTER: Pardon me?

A Seminal fluid present probably but no sperm cells were identified.

THE COURT: Please slow down just one little

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

||bit.

2 | THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

- 3 Q (By Mr. Elliott) For the jury tell us the difference 4 between seminal fluid and sperm cells.
  - A Well, there are -- seminal fluid is a carrier agent for the sperm cell that's found in semen. Semen is a very complexed mixed -- body fluid mixture. And semen -- or sperm cells and seminal fluids are only two of the things that we identify in our laboratory, we look for to identify semen. It's a very complexed mixture. There are other things in seminal fluid as well.
    - To simplify it, and I don't want to oversimplify it -so, if I do, correct me -- the seminal fluid is the fluid
      that we carry the sperm cells up to allow them to be
      deposited, and then the fluid perhaps might run away but the
      sperm cells would still be there.
  - A Very possible, yes.
    - Q Okay, Go ahead.
    - A Okay. Q3, identified PEPA (1), no ESD, and PGM (1), and subtyping was ultranegative. That could indicate that the information again I'm picking up could be coming from the semen donor because I don't have ESD. ESD is not found in sperm cells or semen.
    - On Q4, identified semen, type "A" blood group substance, and FGM (1). Subtyping results were negative.

again indicating that the information I'm picking up possibly could be coming from the semen donor.

Q5, identified semen, the blood group substances "A+H," PEPA (1), ESD (1), PGM (1), and PGM-subtype (1+). This indicates to me again a mixture. Information as far as electrophoresis goes is coming from the victim mainly because I'm identifying the ESD.

On Q6, identified semen, blood group substances "A" and "H." FEPA (1), no ESD, FGM (1). Subtyping results were negative.

On my Q7, I don't identify sperm. I get a positive reaction on my AP screening test. Identify the "H" blood group substance and only PGM (1). Indicates that this information is coming from the victim.

Q Now, let me interrupt you there. You've lost me. I don't understand you.

I thought you said earlier the seminal fluid was foreign to the victim.

A It is. I said my AP spot reaction was positive.

That's just a screening assay. It's not a positive test for seminal fluid.

Q Okay. So, when you're saying here at the end you're getting reactions -- you think you're getting these reactions from the victim, you're not indicating whether the seminal fluid or the sperm came from the victim.

A No, I'm not.

The vaginal secretions does also contain levels of acid phosphatase. The reaction I got was not a level conducive or indicative of seminal acid phosphatase levels. It was a weak reaction. But I got the reaction, so I recorded my results.

Q Okay.

A Okay?

I identified the secretor blood group substance "A," indicative of type "O" person, was consistent with that of the victim, and PGM (1).

On Q7, identified semen, the blood group substances "A" and "H." And I did no further test on that sample.

On Q9, identified semen, the blood group substance "A." The only test I attempted to do on that was subtyping. My results were negative.

On Q10, identified semen. And I attempted to do subtying; however, my results were negative.

And then I'll go to --

Okay. So, let me stop you there and see if I understand you.

You identified -- well, how would you characterize the amount of semen that you identified on State's 87, the pillows? Or can you as far as amount?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Small, large, medium? Or can you? As far as quantity.

Well, I'm not sure that I can say amount. There were a number of -- I thought an unusually large number of semen stains, but I have mixed body fluids, a mixture there. It would indicate that there could be. Yeah, I could say that there was probably a lot -- well, more than one ejaculate would indicate to me.

Okay. And I believe you indicated that the semen that you found present on the pillows, the pillows that were underneath the victim's head, you determined that the semen donor was an "A" secretor?

That's correct.

Okay. Go ahead.

Okay. I go to State's Exhibit Number 88. It's a flat white sheet. And that was a sheet taken from the bed of the victim.

I isolated nine different stained areas, and I also identified urine stains on the sheet. The tests that I performed on the sheet are the same type of tests that I performed on the pillow.

I'll start out with my Q1. I did not identify semen. I could not detect any secretor blood group substances. Identified FEPA (1) and PGM (1). ESD results and PGM-subtyping results were negative.

Q2 was a massive bloodstain. It had numerous

semen stains surrounding the bloodstains in that. I 1 identified semen, type ABO blood group substance "A," and --2 let me look at my results here -- FGM (1), I believe -- let 3 me be sure -- PEPA (1), ESD (1), PGM (1), and PGM-subtype (1+).5 On Q3, identified semen, ABO type "A" blood 6 group substance. 7 Now, explain what you mean by that. When you say "ABO 8 blood type substance," are you saying the semen donor is "A" blood type? 10 11 He's a secretor. Yes, an "A" secretor. Okay. On Q3 I got no results on my FGM-12 subtyping. I did not attempt a conventional method on Q3 13 because of its limited quantity. 14 On Q4, identified semen, the ABO blood group 15 substance "A." Identified only PGM (1). My results for 16 subtyping were negative. 17 On Q5, identified semen, the ABO secretor blood 18 group substance "A." And I did not do any further testing 19 because of the limited size. 20 On Q6, identified semen and type "A" blood 21

Q7, identified semen, the ABO blood group substance "A," FGM -- FEPA (1), ESD (1), FGM (1). Subtyping results were negative.

group substance. And no further tests were done.

22

23

24

On Q8, identified semen. Could not detect any 1 secretor blood group substances. And there was not enough 2 sample to do any further testing. 3 On Q9 I did not identify any semen present. 4 PGM-subtyping results were negative. 5 The next item that I analyzed --6 Okay. Let me interrupt you at that point. 7 In summary then, as to reference to State's 8 Exhibit 88, which is the flat sheet, that was from underneath 9 the victim, I believe. 10 That's correct. 11 You again took nine separate little cutouts of the 12 sheet as you did on the pillows. 13 Yes, I did. 14 And of those nine sheets (sic), you identified sperm 15 on seven of the areas; right? 16 Yes: correct. 17 And of those seven you identified the semen donor 18 again as an "A" secretor on six of those seven. 19 That's correct. 20 Q Okay. 21 The next item would be State's Exhibit Number 90, 22 which is the nightgown taken from the victim. I identified 23 four different stain areas on the nightgown, Q1 through Q4. 24

25

My Q1, identified semen. My secretor typing

results were inconclusive. And I did not get any results from the -- on electrophoresis.

On Q2, identified semen, the ABO secretor blood group substance "A." Subtyping results were negative.

On Q3, identified semen. Again, the secretor typing results were inconclusive. No secretor blood group -- well, no electrophoresis were conducted on that sample.

Q4, identified semen, ESD (1), and PGM (1), and I also identified the ABO blood group antigen "H," which is indicative of type "O" blood.

Q Okay. So, in summary there, you took four little cuttings out of the victim's nightgown, as you did on the pillow.

A That's correct.

Q And of those four questioned areas or cuttings, you found positive for sperm in all four of those.

A Correct.

And of those four you were able to determine if the semen donor was "A" on one of the four and it was inconclusive as to the other three.

A It was inconclusive as to two of them. On two of them, I attempted to -- because of the size of Q4 I wanted to also preserve as much of that as I could. I wanted to identify -- because of the location of Q4, I wanted to identify what blood type that was. And that's why I

performed that particular test. 1 Okay. Proceed on. 2 On State's Exhibit Number 89A, it's the blood sample 3 obtained from I determined that she's a type "O" secretor and that her genetic markers are as follows: 5 PEPA (1), ESD (1), and PGM (1). And she subtypes PGM (1+). 6 On 89B are two vaginal fornix swabs. 7 Identified semen, the ABO secretor blood group substance "A," 8 PEPA (1), ESD (1), FGM (1), and subtype (1+). 9 On 89C, cervical swabs, I identified semen. 10 Could not detect secretor typing results. Could detect blood 11 group substances, I should say. PEPA (1), ESD (1), PGM (1), 12 and subtyping results were negative. 13 On 89D, which are the rectal swabs. I 14 identified semen. No secretor blood group substances 15 detected. Identified PEPA (1), ESD (1), and PGM (1). 16 So, in summary there you determined from the 17 vaginal swabs, both the fornix and the cervix, tested 18 positive for sperm. 19 Yes. 20 Which is foreign to Mrs. 21 That's correct. 22 And as to the fornix swab, you identified as the semen 23 donor was blood type "A." That's correct. A 25

- 1 Q Then as to the rectal swabs, again you found positive 2 for sperm.
  - A Yes.

- Q Which again would also be foreign to Mrs. there as well.
  - A That's correct.

Okay. On State's Exhibit Number 100, the dried stain of the liquid blood sample of Robert Lee Miller, and also I believe State's Exhibit Number 49, which is the liquid sample of blood from Robert Lee Miller, I determined that he's an ABO type "A" person. He is a secretor. And his genetic markers are as follows: He's a PEPA (1), ESD (2-1), a PGM (1). He's a PGM-subtype (1-).

- Again, when you say -- determined that he was an ABO blood type group "A," you're saying he's "A" blood.
- A Type "A" blood, yes.
- Q All right. "A" secretor to be more exact.
  - A He's an "A" secretor, yes.
- Q All right.
- I also performed ABO blood typing grouping results on all of the liquid blood samples that were submitted to our laboratory in reference to all of the other people that I named earlier. I also conducted electrophoresis on those samples.

On Ra-Heru Khepra, also known as Roderick

```
Wilson, I identified type "A" blood, ESD (1), PEPA (1), PGM
 1
    (1), and he subtypes (1+).
 2
                  On Jesse McDonald, type "A" blood, PEPA (1),
 3
    ESD (1), PGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-).
 4
           Let me back up to the Roderick Wilson. You determined
 5
    he was an "A" secretor or a nonsecretor?
 6
           "A" secretor.
 7
           Okay. And as to Jesse McDonald, Jr., an "A" secretor
 8
    or a nonsecretor?
           McDonald's blood type was not tested for that.
10
           Okay.
11
           Ernest McDonald, type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD (2-1),
12
    PGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-). He is a secretor.
13
                  Myrle Blunt, type "O" blood, PEPA (2-1), ESD
14
    (1), PGN (1). Subtypes PGM (1+). His secretor status is
15
    unknown.
16
                  Mengesha Tamrat is a type "A" blood, PEPA (1),
17
    ESD (2), PGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-). Lewis results were
18
    a-neg/b-neg.
19
                  Johnny Cook, type "O" blood, PEPA (1), ESD (1),
20
    FGM (2-1). He subtypes a (2-1-), and he is a secretor.
21
                  Melvin Nickelberry is type "O" blood, PEPA (1),
22
    ESD (1), FGM (1). He subtypes (1-). He is classified as a
23
    nonsecretor.
24
                  Leslie Filson is type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
```

```
(1), PGM (1). He subtypes (1+). He is a secretor.
 1
                  Terry Barkus is type "O" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
 2
    (1), FGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-). He is a secretor.
 3
 4
                  J. C. Jones, type "O" blood, PEPA (2-1), ESD
    (2-1), PGM (2-1). He subtypes (2+1+), and he is a secretor.
 5
                  Michael Adams, type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
 6
    (2-1), PGM (2-1), subtypes (2-1+). He is a secretor.
 7
                  Lynn Amous, type "A" blood, PEPA (2-1), ESD
 8
    (2-1), and PGM (1). He subtypes a (1+). He is a secretor.
 9
                  Lawrence Forbes, type "O" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
10
    (1), PGM (1), subtypes (1+1-). His blood was not checked for
11
    the Lewis factor.
12
                  Ira Moore was type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
13
    (1), FGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-). Secretor status is
14
    unknown.
15
                  David Burch, type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD (1),
16
    PGM (1), subtypes (1+1-). He is a nonsecretor.
17
                  Joe Dawson, type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
18
    (2-1), PGM (1). He subtypes (1+). He is a secretor.
19
20
                  Darrell Taylor, type "A" blood, PEPA (1), ESD
    (1), PGM (1), subtypes (1+1-). His secretor status is
21
    unknown.
22
                  Clem Jeffries has type "A" blood. He's a PEPA
23
    (1), ESD (1), and PGM (1). Subtypes (1+). He's a
24
    nonscretor.
25
```

Walter Stephens is type "A" blood, PEPA (2-1), ESD (1), FGM (1). He subtypes (1+1-). His secretor status is unknown.

I was also asked to examine blood obtained from a Detrick White. He has type "A" blood. He's a PEPA (2-1), ESD (1), PGM (1). He subtypes a (1+1-). The Lewis test was not done on his blood.

Matthew Triplet is type "A" blood. He's PEPA (1), ESD (2-1), FGM (2-1), subtypes (2+1+). Lewis test not done.

And that was it for the blood typing tests.

Q Okay. Did you also do hair comparisons and analyses in this case in your capacity as forensic chemist for the Oklahoma City Police Department in items that you've just identified?

A I did.

Q Could you first of all briefly explain the procedures you go through in hair comparison analysis prior to any conclusions?

Okay. First of all, the hairs are removed from items, garments, or clothing, or whatever. They are placed on clean microscope slides and held in place with the glue we call Fermount and cover slips place — applied to it. Makes a semi-permanent mount. That's allowed to dry so — at least 24 hours before we begin our examination.

,

The examination is done using a transmitted light microscope, a comparison microscope. A comparison microscope is simply two microscopes held together by a common bridge, two separate stages, that will allow us to examine, look at two samples at the same time. I can control my field of view. I can split the screen to look at two slides at the same time side by side, or I can look at one side by maintaining — occupying a whole field of view microscope, binocular microscope.

Hair comparisons are conducted at 400 power, so that you can see all the characteristics inside.

One of the things about hair comparisons is that on fibers you have to first of all identify — determine whether or not what you're looking at is a fiber or a hair. Unless you've made that distinction, then you need to go on to determine whether or not that hair is human or animal. And after I've made that determination, I begin to — I can classify that hair as being — as far as a race goes, whether or not that hair came from a Caucasian, Negroid, or Mongoloid person.

I can also tell body origin, that hair came from the scalp, if it came from the pubic area, or other parts of the body. I can tell how that hair was removed, if it fell out naturally or if it was forcibly removed. I can tell if that hair has been chemically treated, like being

dyed or bleached. I can also tell how -- if that hair has been -- if it has ever been cut, what type of instrument was more -- most probably used to cut that hair.

The characteristics that we look at -- look for in hair comparison can number anywhere from seven or eight to as many as 25, depending on the type of hair you're looking at.

I compare scalp hairs to scalp hairs, pubic hairs to pubic hairs. We don't cross -- we don't compare pubic hairs to scalp hairs.

In a human hair, if I can back up a little bit, a human hair can be analogous to a regular wooden pencil.

The eraser of the pencil itself could be likened to the root of a hair. Now, we like to have the entire hair so we can do our examination starting at the root end and going all the way out to the tip end of the hair. And during the course of an examination of that hair, from the root to the tip, focusing up and down, I will identify the characteristics or the variations of characteristics seen in that particular hair sample.

The paint of the hair (sic) can be likened to the cuticle, the coating surrounding the hair itself. The cuticle is normally colorless. If present it can range in thickness. And on the shape or condition of that cuticle depend upon hygiene environment and other factors.

The wood of the pencil itself can be likened to an area we call a cortex. It's in the cortex the pigmentation or color of our hairs are found. Cortex contains quite a few characteristics that we look for when we do examinations.

The central portion of the pencil, the lead portion, can be likened to an object we call the medulla or medulla, depending on your pronunciation. If present in the hair, it can be continuous or one long piece or broken up in portions of varying lengths if it is present. And it can — it can be of forensic value, information, as far as our examination goes.

Those basic things are the things that I look for when I'm doing my hair comparisons. Depending on the number of hairs you have to look at, the reference hairs you have to look at, you establish a range of a person's characteristics. No hairs — no two hairs in your head are going to be exactly alike. So, you're going to have to have a good representative sampling of hair. And I will establish a range of good characteristics. And based on my experience and training, I will determine — make determinations as to whether or not one hair could match another hair.

There are three things, three conclusions that can be made, arrived at in doing a hair comparison. First of all, that this hair is consistent with -- the reference hairs

0

are consistent with the unknown hairs and could share a common source or could have come from that particular individual.

Or the reference hairs are not consistent microscopically with the unknown hairs and could not have come from this same source or individual. You can positively eliminate someone on a hair comparison, but you cannot identify anyone on a hair comparison. You can only include them as being a possible donor.

The third thing that I can say about in my conclusions about a hair comparison is that there are either too many similarities or dissimilarities or there's too much damage or the hair fragments — the hairs are not long enough to allow a valid conclusion to be reached as to whether or not these hairs could have come from an individual.

Okay. Those are the three things I can say.

THE COURT: When you reach a convenient place,
we'll adjourn.

MR. ELLIOTT: This might be as convenient as any, Judge.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we will take a recess until 1:30.

Do not discuss the case at all. Do not permit anyone to talk about it to you.

. \_

Is that it?

MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

(Whereupon, the following transpired in open court, the defendant personally present with counsel, counsel for the State present, and the jury in the box:)

THE COURT: We'll continue.

MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q (By Mr. Elliott) Okay. Miss Gilchrist, I believe we were at the point where you had just concluded explaining to the jury what analyses and what observations and what things you did in reference to hair comparisons. And I believe I asked you — if I did not, I'll repeat it — if you performed any of those analyses or any of those types of comparisons on items that I asked you to identify and we've introduced in evidence in this case.

A I did.

Now, if you would, again referring to State's exhibit number and description, tell us what your conclusions were in reference to any or all hair comparisons.

A Okay. State's Exhibit Number 85A, which is a top of the bed, I identified five Negroid scalp hair fragments; however, those hairs were not suitable for forensic hair comparison due to the length of those hairs and the damage

- that I observed on them also.
- Q Let me ask you at that point, you did determine that they were Negroid hairs.
- 4 A Yes.

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And you did determine they were scalp hairs.
- 6 A That's correct.
- Put you were unable to to compare those to any reference hairs that you had in this case.
  - A That's correct.
    - Q Will the fact that were unable to compare them to any specific reference hairs, does that prevent you or -- well, just prevent you from determining, one, that they're Negroid, and two, that they're scalp?
    - l A No.
      - Q In other words, you can do that even though they're still not comparable to any certain --
  - A That's true.
- 18 | Q Okay.
  - A State's Exhibit Number 85B, which is the bottom pillow, I identified one Negroid scalp hair fragment. Now, I saw points of similarities with the reference scalp hairs of the defendant, Robert Lee Miller; however, this hair showed too much damage for me to conclude that it could have come from him. I could not include or exclude him as being the donor of that hair.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

hairs.

hairs of

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Q But there were -- there were some things that were similar.

There were points that were similar as far as the characteristics go, but I could not reach a determination as to whether or not that hair could have come from him.

Okay. Proceed on.

I see.

State's Exhibit 85C are hairs taken from the throat area of the victim. Identified three Negroid scalp hair

fragments and one Negroid pubic hair fragment that I could

not associate or make a forensic comparison due to the length

and the amount of damage to those hairs.

however, two Negroid scalp hair fragments where no

conclusions could be reached as to whether or not these hairs

could have come from Miller due to the amount of damage;

however, I did see, you know, points of similarities in the

characteristics of that hair in comparison to his reference

State's Exhibit 87 is one white pillow. Identified one scalp hair that's consistent with the scalp

I skipped one. I'm sorry.

State's Exhibit 86 is the knotted white pillow Identified one Negroid scalp hair fragment that had been too badly damaged in order to be suitable for forensic

comparison; however, I could tell that the hair had been forcibly removed. One Negroid limb hair fragment. Again, I didn't have any reference hairs -- limb hairs to compare it. I believe that was an arm hair fragment.

Q Okay.

State's Exhibit 88 is a flat sheet. I identified five scalp hairs and seven pubic hairs that are consistent with I identified two Negroid scalp hair fragments that were consistent with Robert Lee Miller. However, there are six Caucasian pubic hair fragments that were not suitable for forensic comparison; four Caucasian limb hairs — and I didn't have any Caucasian reference limb hairs to compare; eight Negroid scalp hair fragments that were not suitable for forensic comparison; one Negroid scalp hair fragment that showed points of similarity of characteristics of Miller's hair, but they were too badly damaged to allow me to conclude as to whether or not they could have come from him; four Negroid pubic hair fragments not suitable for forensic comparison; two Negroid limb hair fragments, no reference to use; and two animal hair fragments; and five fibers.

From State's Exhibit Number 90, which is the nightgown, I identified four scalp hairs and three pubic hairs consistent with . I also identified two Negroid scalp hair fragments not suitable for forensic comparison; one Negroid facial hair fragment not suitable

for forensic comparison; two fibers.

9.

Amcare. I identified ten scalp hairs that were consistent with . I also identified one Caucasian scalp hair that was not consistent with .; one Caucasian limb hair not consistent — I don't have any limb hairs to compare with them; three fibers; one fiber clump; and one animal hair fragment.

In State's Exhibit Number 92, which is the body sheet, one flat body sheet from Amcare, identified two animal hairs taken from the bottom Amcare sheet, are microscopically consistent with the dog hairs obtained from a rottweiler named Bear and could share a common source.

- Q Okay. In summary, if I understood you correctly, and correct me if I'm wrong, as to the hairs that were taken from the top of the bed very near the victim's neck, you identified five Negroid scalp hairs that were, as you would call them, fragments and therefore not suitable for comparison to anyone.
- A That's correct.
- In reference to State's Exhibit 85B, the bottom pillow that was taken out from underneath Mrs. head, you identified again one Negroid scalp hair fragment that did have points of similarities to Robert Lee Miller but not enough to say they were consistent with.

1 A That's correct.
2 Q In reference to

- In reference to State's 85C, the hairs that were taken from the throat area of Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_, you found six Negroid hair fragments, five of which were scalp, one of which was pubic, and of those six, again, two of those had points of similarities to the defendant, Robert Lee Miller, but again not enough to say they're consistent with.
- A That's correct.
- In referring to State's 86, the knotted pillow case, you found one Negroid scalp hair, again, although it was not suitable enough because of the size of fragmentation to compare it to anyone.
- A Correct.
  - And as to State's 87, pillow from underneath the victim's head, you did identify one scalp hair that was in fact consistent with Mrs.
- A That's correct.
- As to State's 88, the flat sheet from the bed area, you found seven hairs that were consistent with Mrs.

  five scalp -- excuse me -- twelve hairs that were consistent with Mrs.

  five scalp and seven pubic.
- 22 A Yes.
  - Q And you also found two scalp hair fragments that were microscopically consistent with those coming from Robert Lee Miller.

Λ That's correct. 1 Also you found again one Negroid fragment along with 2 the two that were microscopically consistent, you found one 3 that was, again, points of similarities but not enough to go as far as saying they were microscopically consistent. 5 That's correct. 6 On the flat sheet, along with those three particular 7 hairs, you found eight Negroid scalp hair fragments. Again, 8 Negroid scalp but not enough due to the fragmentation to 9 determine whether that would be consistent with anyone. 10 That's correct. 11 Also, four more Negroid pubic hairs. Again, able to 12 determine that they were Negroid in nature and pubic in 13 nature but not enough due to the fragmentation to determine 14 they were consistent with anyone. 15 Correct. 16 And also two Negroid limb hair fragments -- limb 17 meaning arm and leg? 18 Arm hairs is what I determined them to be. 19 But again you had nothing there to compare them to; 20 correct? 21 That's correct. 22

And moving to State's Exhibit 90, the nightgown in

was wearing, you identified seven hairs

, four from the scalp area and

23

24

25

which Mrs.

consistent with Mrs.

- three from the pubic area.
- A Correct.

- And again, you found three Negroid hairs, two from the scalp, one from the facial. Again, the fragmentation is to the point where you could not microscopically compare those to anything else.
  - A That's correct.
- Q And as to State's Exhibit Number 96, you determined the dog hairs that were removed -- or the animal hairs that you determined were dog hairs; is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Taken from the bottom Amcare sheet were consistent microscopically with the hairs that had been removed from a dog, rottweiler dog by the name of Bear.
- A That's correct.
- Now, did you do any hair comparisons in reference to these other hair samples that you had been submitted to in reference to all these other individuals that you listed earlier that you had received samples from, Roderick Wilson, Jesse McDonald, and et cetera?
- A I did.
- Q Could you tell us those results, please?
- 23 A Okay. I'll read this disclaimer first.
  - All the names listed I'm about to read now, all the people were eliminated as a possible donor of the hairs

that were found suitable for forensic comparison: 1 Khepra, Clem Jeffries, Ronald Lott, Darrell Taylor, Jesse 2 McDonald, Jr., Ernest McDonald, Leslie Filson, Mengesha 3 Tamrat, Walter Stevens, Lynn Amous, and Michael Adams. So, if I understood you correctly, even though the 5 hair comparisons are not -- are not positive such as a 6 fingerprint and you can't make it one on one or you can't 7 positively say any of these hairs come from a person to the 8 exclusion of anyone else, you can exclude people by hair 9 comparisons. 10 That's correct. 11 And if I understood you correctly, the eleven names 12 that you just read, you did exclude those people as having 13 been the donor of the hairs found at the 14 that correct? 15 That is correct. 16 Now, going back to your analysis of the body fluids. 17 and again for a brief quick summary as much as from what I 18 understand taken from my notes, in your analyses and tests 19 ran on all of the semen stains that you found from the items 20 recovered from the scene of the 21 homicide, did you find any semen donor other than an "A" secretor? 22 I did not. 23

was blood type

And you determined that Mrs.

24

25

"0."

1 | A Yes.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Did you determine that Robert Lee Miller was an "A" secretor?
  - A That's correct.
  - And you determined that the semen donor of the semen stains that you identified was an "A" secretor.
  - A That is correct.
  - Now, in reference to the vaginal swabs in which you detected semen and the anal swab which you detected semen, had she been dead -- had Mrs. been dead for a two- or three-day period, would that affect your ability to determine the presence of semen?
  - A It could affect it, yes, due to drainage and bacterial, you know, decomposition too.
  - Q Well, would it affect it to the degree of not being able to determine the blood type of the semen donor?
  - A Depends on how much was left. I had enough from some of the swabs to determine blood type.
  - Q Okay. So, even though it would affect the amount, you had enough in this case.
- A That's correct.
- Now, do you have an opinion based on your observations of the two pillows, State's Exhibit 87, as to the location of those pillows when the semen was deposited on them?
  - A Correction. There's only one pillow that has semen

stains that I identified that have semen stains on them. Out of 87. That's correct. Okav. Now, you need to repeat your question. Do you have an opinion as to where that pillow was located at the time the semen was deposited on it? 5 I do. 6 And where would that be? 7 MR. EVANS: Judge, I object to that unless some 8 expertise can be shown that she's qualified to answer that 9 question. 10 THE COURT: Overruled. I'll let her answer. 11 It is my opinion that one of the pillows in Exhibit. 12 Number 87 was at one time under the body of 13 (By Mr. Elliott) And in reference to State's Exhibit 14 88 ---15 MR. ELLIOTT: And may I approach the witness. 16 Judge? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 (By Mr. Elliott) -- which is the flat sheet -- okay. 19 In reference to State's 88 --20 First of all, you indicated earlier that you 21 took various questioned samples from there. Can you open 22 State's 88 and show those to us, please? 23 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I'll need assistance with this. May I step down, please? 25

THE COURT: Yes.

A Now, as I stated earlier, I took a number of cuttings from the stains on this sheet. The largest semen stain sample was found in this area (indicating), which I called my Q2. The rest of the cuttings I took -- I also identified urine on this sheet, in addition to various bloodstains and semen stains. And again, the greatest amount was found here (indicating). I also identified semen stains on some -- mixed in with blood over here (indicating) that appeared to be wipe marks.

Q (By Mr. Elliott) Could you explain what you mean by that?

A bloody object had come in contact with blood that was consistent with the blood type of Mrs.

It also had -- Miss

I'm sorry. And also had some semen mixed in with it. It was wiped across this sheet.

Q Okay.

MR. ELLIOTT: Your Honor, may we approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(By Mr. Elliott) I'll now hand you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibits 125, 126, and 127 and ask you to look at those please. Can you tell me what those are?

A Yes, I can. These are cuttings taken by Janice Davis

in reference to a sheet obtained from the crime scene of Anna 1 Fowler. Okay. Thank you. 3 I believe you indicated this earlier in this 4 case. If not, do you have an opinion based on your 5 observations of the pillow in State's Exhibit 87 and the 6 sheet in State's Exhibit 88 as to the possible number of 7 ejaculations that occurred? 8 I do. Α 9 And what is that opinion? 10 My opinion that it had to have occurred at least two 11 or more, ejaculations. 12 THE COURT: Anything further? 13 MR. MACY: Just a second, Judge. 14 (By Mr. Elliott) Miss Gilchrist, do you have an 15 opinion as -- you indicated on State's Exhibit 88 that 16 something had been smeared, contained a mixture of Mrs. 17 blood and seminal fluid or semen. Do you have an 18 opinion as to what object made that or what this wiping 19 motion was made with? 20 Your Honor, once again, note my MR. EVANS: 21 objections to lack of foundation that she has any particular 22 expertise in blood splatter or blood pattern analysis. 23 THE COURT: Overruled. She may answer. 24 Yes, I do have an opinion.

(By Mr. Elliott) And what is that, please? 1 It is my opinion that possibly fingers made those 3 marks. 4 MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions, Judge. 5 THE COURT: You may cross-examine. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: 7 Miss Gilchrist, as somebody who barely made it through 8 9 high school chemistry, if you bear with me on some of these 10 ideas and concepts. 11 Let's start with hair comparisons generally. Can we conclude that since no hairs matching or no hairs that 12 are consistent with an individual found at a crime scene that 13 that individual is eliminated? 14 I wouldn't conclude that, no. 15 16 Had you found no hairs at all consistent with 17 Robert's, you still would not have been prepared to come to 18 court and testify that he can be eliminated as a suspect due to the fact that none of his hair's been found; is that 19 20 right? That I'm not prepared to eliminate him? 21 Well, I suppose that's a complicated way of asking you 22 23 the question. The fact that you find -- the fact that you do 24 25 not find an individual's hairs at the scene or rather an

```
individual's -- or hairs that are consistent with any given
 1
     individual doesn't mean you exclude him as a possible
 2
     suspect; is that correct?
 3
            That's correct. There are other factors to take into
    consideration.
 5
            Now, we know certain things about Miss
                                                              blood;
 6
    right?
 7
            That's correct.
 8
           We know that she was an "O" secretor type blood;
 9
    right?
10
           That's correct.
11
           So, when we find a semen stain that corresponds to an
12
    "A" type blood, we know -- well, obviously she couldn't
13
    create the semen.
14
           That's correct.
15
           We know that the person who deposited that is an "A;"
16
    right?
17
           That's right.
18
    Α
           Now, to skip through several steps --
19
                  MR. EVANS: Can I approach the witness, Judge?
20
                   THE COURT:
                               Yes.
21
           (By Mr. Evans) There's an individual that I'm
22
    interested in, the individual that you tested known as Rod
23
    Wilson and his alias is Ra-Heru Khepra. It's spelled R-A,
24
    hyphen, H-E-R-U, and then Khepra, last name,
25
```

```
capital K-H-E-P-R-A.
 1
 2
            Okay.
            You tested that individual in regard to the Cutler
 3
    case; is that right?
 4
 5
            That's correct.
            And you found that he was a blood type "A" secretor;
 6
 7
    is that right?
 8
            That's right.
           He's an Esterase (1), ESD (1). I didn't say that
    right. It's ESD (1); right?
10
11
           ESD (1), yes.
           But that's meaningless for purposes of our analysis
12
    because ESD doesn't show up in semen; correct?
           That's correct.
14
15
           So, that's worthless for our analysis in this case.
16
                   We know that Khepra is a PGM (1); correct?
           Yes; that's correct.
17
18
           And that's consistent with the PGM that you broke out
    in some of the stains in this case; is that right?
19
           That's correct.
20
           And in all fairness it's also consistent with Miss
21
22
    Cutler's PGM type.
           That is also correct.
23
```

So, we can't tell whether Khepra or, to be fair,

Robert Miller -- he's also a PGM (1); right?

24

```
1
           So, Miss
                             Mr. Khepra, and Robert all have PGM
 2
    (1).
 3
           That is correct.
           Okay. So, for purposes of our analysis of this case,
 5
    the PGM is also not of great significance; correct?
 6
           Well, not necessarily. Some of the stains off some of
 7
    the items that I analyzed, I picked up an ABO type "A" blood
    group substance, no "H." I picked up PEFA (1), PGM (1), no
    ESD. That leaves me to conclude that probably that
10
    information I'm getting is coming from the semen donor and
11
    not the victim.
                     Okay? So, that tells me that at least a
12
    semen donor is an "A" secretor and he's a PGM (1).
13
           Which is consistent with both Khepra --
14
           That is consistent with both Ra-Heru and Robert
15
    Miller.
16
           Okay. Now, we have the enzyme PEPA. Khepra is a (1)
17
    as is Robert; is that correct?
18
           That's correct.
19
20
           That enzyme is exactly the same in both of them;
    right?
21
           That's correct.
22
           And that is also an enzyme that was found in some of
23
    your analyses of the semen stains in this case.
24
    Α
           That's correct.
25
```

That's right.

- Then we come over to the next subtype -- the next genetic marker is the PGM-subtype. Now, we know Miss is a (1+) subtype.
  - A Yes.

4

10

17

18

19

21

22

- Which is consistent with some of the stains -- or in fact all of the stains that you were able to subtype had a (1+); right?
  - A That's correct.
    - Q Now, Robert Miller has a (1-), which is inconsistent with the semen stains that you were able to subtype; right?
- 11 A That's correct.
- 12 | Q And Ra-Heru Khepra is a (1+), which is consistent with 13 | the semen stain you were able --
- 14 | A That's correct.
- 15 | Q -- to type; correct?
- 16 A That's correct.
  - Now, you eliminated Mr. Khepra in this case based on the fact that his hairs did not match?
  - A That is correct.
- 20 | Q Okay. But it's not on the basis of any serology.
  - A Serologically I could not exclude him. I had to go ahead and do the hair comparisons in order to say whether or not he could be still a possible suspect.
- 24 Q The fact that you found no hairs at Mrs.
  25 scene that are consistent with the hairs of Ra-Heru Khepra

led you to eliminate Mr. Khepra; is that right? 1 That's right. 2 MR. EVANS: If the Court will bear with me --3 THE COURT: All right. 4 MR. EVANS: -- I'll proceed in just a second. 5 (By Mr. Evans) Just so we're clear, moving to hair 6 analysis -- back to hair analysis, a hair is not like a 7 fingerprint. 8 No, it's not. 9 Right? 10 If you have somebody's fingerprint, there's 11 none of this consistent or inconsistent. It's either him or 12 it's not; right? 13 Pretty much so, yeah. There are points of identifying 14 characteristics to identify someone. 15 You have sufficient sample, so to speak; right? 16 Correct. 17 Okay. And you're not saying when you say that two of 18 the fragments that you found in bed are consistent with 19 Robert. You're not saying that they're his hairs, are you? 20 No, I'm not. 21 It's certainly possible that the hairs were donated 22 there by somebody else. 23 There's always that possibility. All I can say is 24

those hairs could have come from Robert Lee Miller.

```
And when we talk about comparing animal hairs, or the animal hairs that you compared in this case, when you say that the hairs are consistent with a dog named Bear, you're not saying that the hairs came from that dog, are you?
```

- A No, I'm not.
- 6 Q You're saying that it's a possibility.
- 7 A It's a possibility they could have came from that dog.
  - Q But it could have come from a number of other dogs; correct?
- 10 A Correct.

- Would you consider -- I've got the <u>Handbook of</u>

  Forensic Science put out by the F.B.I., Joyce. Would you

  consider that a good resource material?
- 14 A Resource for what?
- 15 | Q Well, for learning about hair analysis.
- 16 A No, I wouldn't.
- 17 Q You would not consider this an authoritative text then.
- 19 A No.
- 20 | Q Okay. Do you know Janice Davis Lyhane?
- 21 A Yes, I do.
- Q Okay. Scientific Evidence in Criminal Cases by
  Moenssens, Moses, and Inbau. Would you consider this an
  authoritative text?
- 25 A I've never read that book. I've seen passages from

that book, but I've never actually read it. 1 Okay. Would you agree with this passage: Animal hair comparisons are usually not as determinative and conclusive 3 as human hair comparisons. The variations found in the hair from a single animal can be very great. It is also difficult 5 to differentiate between breed of a same animal family by hair comparison. 7 Would you agree with that statement? 8 I would. I would, yes. 9 And when you say that the hairs are consistent with 10 the dog Bear, we can't even break down whether the hairs came 11 from a rottweiler or a Labrador retriever or any other dog 12 with black hair; is that correct? 13 That's correct. I'm comparing the unknown hairs with 14 reference hairs taken from -- obtained from rottweilers in 15 this particular case. Had there been Labrador reference 16 hairs, I would have compared those and drawn whatever 17 conclusions possible. 18 Mr. Elliott ran down the hairs that were found at or 19 near the scene of Mrs. 20 bed. There's some things that perhaps -- let me direct your attention to that part in 21 your report, Joyce. There are some things that perhaps you 22 went over that I missed. Let me -- bear with me, please. 23

24

25

please.

THE COURT: Just stand behind the podium,

MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. 1 2 (By Mr. Evans) You examined some hairs that were 3 taken from a black sock that was found in Miss bed: is that correct? 5 I did. 6 Okay. And you found no hairs as to that black sock that were consistent with Robert Miller, did you? 7 8 No. I did not. 9 You found a scalp hair that was consistent with 10 right? 11 Yes. Yes. 12 But you also found one Negroid scalp hair that was not consistent with either Miller or anybody else; is that 13 correct? 14 That's correct. 15 So, we have a Negroid hair on the sock that was found 16 17 under the covers of Miss bed that's inconsistent with Robert Miller and could not have come from him; correct? 18 That's correct. 19 20 Absolutely 100 percent could not have come from Robert Miller. 21 That's correct; it could not have. 22 And moving along down to the knotted pillow case that 23 24 you examined and looked at some hairs that were found around the knotted pillow case, as to that item, you found no hairs 25

; correct?

That's correct. 2 You found no hairs that were consistent with Robert 3 Miller; correct? That's incorrect. 5 Q Okay. 6 The asterisk by that hair, Mr. Evans, means that that 7 hair was not suitable for forensic comparison; therefore, I 8 can't say whether or not it came from Mr. Miller. 9 Okay. I think my question was you found none 10 consistent with Miller. 11 I can't answer that. I don't know if they're 12 consistent with. They weren't suitable for forensic 13 comparison. 14 Okav. And also you found as to that knotted pillow 15 case one Negroid limb hair that was suitable for forensic 16 comparisons: correct? 17 Well, it was a short limb hair. I have no reference 18 limb hairs to compare. And the F.B.I. also recommends --19 Well, that's not my question. 20 Well --21 If I could get an answer to my question first. 22 Okay. 23 You found one Negroid limb hair that was suitable for 24 microscopic comparison that was on the knotted pillow case; 25

that were consistent with Miss

```
is that right?
 1
 2
            Not necessarily.
 3
            I guess I'm misreading your report then.
 4
                   Go ahead.
                              Say what you were going to say.
 5
            What I wanted to say is that in our training with the
    F.B.I., they admonish us. We can identify body origins,
 6
    where a hair could have come from. But there are too many
 7
    limiting characteristics found in limb hairs to allow them to
    be suitable for forensic comparisons. And that's what I was
10
    trying to say to you.
11
           So, we can draw no conclusions from the last Negroid
    limb hair as to the knotted pillow case; is that right?
12
           That's correct.
13
14
           Okay. Moving on to the flat sheet, you found four
    Caucasian limb hairs that were not consistent with
15
           on the flat sheet; is that correct?
16
           Well, I don't know if they're consistent with her or
17
18
    not, because I didn't get any reference limb hairs from
19
           Same answer as to the last hair?
20
           Same answer to the last hair.
21
           Okay. Now, as to the Amcare sheet, the top sheet, you
22
    found a scalp hair that was consistent with
23
                                                                is
    that right?
24
25
           That's right.
```

1	Q You found a pubic hair that was consistent with
2	
3	A That's correct.
4	Q You found no hairs consistent with Robert Miller; is
5	that right?
6	A That's correct.
7	Q You found a Caucasian scalp hair that was not
8	consistent with ; right?
9	A That hair showed points of similarities, but there
10	were also some dissimilarities, and that caused me to have to
11	exclude her as being the possible source.
12	Q So, can we say that the first Caucasian scalp hair on
13	the top sheet was not
14	A That's what I'm concluding, yes.
15	Q All right. You found a Caucasian pubic hair,
16	Caucasian pubic hair on the top sheet that was not
17	consistent, inconsistent with the second is that right?
18	A Again, the characteristics in that hair were such that
19	it did not allow me to make a definite arrive at a
20	definite conclusion. And that hair had been awhile also.
21	Q Okay.
22	MR. EVANS: May I approach the witness, Judge?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	Q (By Mr. Evans) Make sure we're reading off the same
25	report, Miss Gilchrist. This is the report I'm looking at.

- It's --We have the same one. Is it the same one? 4 Uh-huh. 5 The report I'm looking at has the Caucasian pubic hair 6 under your "hairs not consistent with any of these" category. Is it the same place in your report? 7 That's in the same place. Okay. And also there was a Negroid hair fragment on the top sheet that you have under the heading "hairs not 10 consistent with any of these;" is that correct? 11 That's correct. 12 So, that Negroid scalp hair is not consistent with 13 Robert Miller. 14 That is correct; it is not consistent. 15 Could not have come from him. 16 Could not have come from him. 17 18 Okay. You're of the opinion that the -- whoever did 19 this to Miss would have ejaculated several times. At least twice. 20 21 So, there was -- we can speak in relative terms as to
  - A There were a large number of seminal stains. Now, the

relatively speaking, a large amount of seminal fluid at this

the scenes of rapes and sexual assaults. There was,

22

23

24

25

scene; is that right?

amount of volume I can't tell you because it also got mixed 1 in with blood. 2 You are familiar, aren't you, Miss Gilchrist, with a 3 process known as DNA analysis? I am. 5 That analysis has been done in a case that is coming 6 up pretty soon involving a defendant named Hayward Reed; is 7 that correct? That's correct. 9 That DNA analysis involved getting a sample of seminal 10 type fluid; is that right? 11 No, that's not correct. 12 Okay. What did you have in that Hayward Reed case as 13 far the crime scene samples? 14 MR. ELLIOTT: Judge, I'm going to object as to 15 was or wasn't --16 THE COURT: Sustained. 17 I don't want to get into any other case, 18 counselor. 19 (By Mr. Evans) The reason for asking the question, 20 Miss Gilchrist -- let me put it to you this way. 21 analysis is a process in which we don't need to talk about 22 consistent with or inconsistent with. It's like a 23

fingerprint; is that correct?

That's correct.

24

It's even better than a fingerprint, isn't it? 1 2 It's like a fingerprint. It I.D.'s someone like a 3 fingerprint, yes. It I.D.'s somebody exactly, that they donated this 5 semen. I'm not sure exactly how the wording is on that. 6 percentile is pretty high, that it could have come from one 7 person to the exclusion of so many other people. 9 Usually like one in four million; right? Λ 10 Or higher, yes. Or higher than four million. 11 12 Yes. And that was not done in this case, was it? 13 14 Α No. it was not. We had the semen. You had the semen. You had a large 15 amount of semen, relatively speaking, that you could have 16 packaged up and sent to Lifecodes in New York, and they could 17 have done the DNA analysis in this case, and we could have 18 known, 100-percent sure whether we had the right man; isn't 19 that correct? 20 21 MR. ELLIOTT: Judge, objection as to that because he's purely speculative there. 22

THE COURT: Sustained.

23

24

25

MR. ELLIOTT: There's no testimony to that.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q (By Mr. Evans) The DNA analysis could have been done in this case; is that right?

MR. ELLIOTT: Again, Judge, objection. That might be -- objection as to outside the scope of this witness. Again, it would be speculative as to what might have been done.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. EVANS: Judge, can we approach the bench?

THE COURT: You may, counselor, but I want to just make my rulings and we move on, right or wrong.

(The following was said outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. EVANS: Okay. Judge, I need to make a record.

I would argue to the Court that the DNA analysis, which she's already testified she's familiar with, she's already testified as to the possible results that DNA analysis can attain, I want to know why it wasn't done in this case. I don't know why that's --

Let me finish, please.

I don't know that's any different than asking somebody that investigated a crime scene who knows about fingerprints why they didn't test for fingerprints. I don't see any difference in the two. Now, all I want to ask her is why it wasn't done in this case. And if there's a good

reason, there's a good reason.

THE COURT: The State?

MR. MACY: Your Honor, this is a process of which became available in only the fairly recent past. There is one laboratory in the United States that does it. It is financially prohibitive for us to submit all of our cases to have that kind of testing. It's not practical. It is not a test that's available to us. We don't have experts here to testify, but I know from being lectured on it that the degree of certainty that you get, it depends on the quantity of it, the conditions of it under which it's been kept, and all that sort of thing.

What he's bringing in now -- he's making it look like we haven't done our job.

MR. EVANS: That's exactly right.

MR. MACY: When in fact that's unethical. He knows that we have.

THE COURT: Just a moment, please.

MR. MACY: We've done everything --

MR. EVANS: And I resent that.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

Mr. Evans, you're going to not only subject yourself to a loss in your pocketbook but a loss of some freedom in the county jail if we have one more outburst.

MR. EVANS: Well, I didn't --

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: All of you govern yourselves

I mean just that.

Yes, sir. MR. EVANS:

Your Honor, if I might speak.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. EVANS: I didn't mean any disrespect to the Court. If it took it as that, I apologize.

If it's financially prohibitive, she can say that. That's fine. I just want to know if it was around. Ι wanted it stated that it was around, it could have been done in this case. I can call a witness to testify that it could have been done in this case if need be.

THE COURT: I'm not going to let you pursue anymore along that line with this witness.

MR. EVANS: All right. Let me make an offer of

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. EVANS: I would make this offer of proof: That if Miss Gilchrist were asked could DNA have been done in this case, she would say, yes. I've asked her that off the record and she has told me it could have been done in this case. I would ask her why it wasn't done in this case. answer that she would give me as to why it wasn't done in this case is that she didn't think of it.

I would further make an offer of proof that

it's not cost prohibitive, that it was done in a rape case where the State is not seeking the ultimate penalty of death. It was done in rape case. It is going to be introduced in a rape case within the next two weeks in the case of <u>State versus Hayward Reed</u>.

I would further state for the record that as my offer of proof that there is not --

(The following was said within the hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: Let me ask the jury to please not talk in the jury box at all.

(The following was said outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. EVANS: There is not only one lab that does this. There's currently three labs that do DNA analyses now. That it could have been done in this case, and it should have been done in this case.

THE COURT: I'm not concerned with the cost factor, frankly, gentlemen. I'm concerned with this being outside the expertise of this witness. It's unlike asking a police officer why were prints not taken. This is not within the investigative — her knowledge is not within that. Hers is to examine things that are presented to her.

I'm not going to let you go into with her, this witness, why this was not done by the State.

MR. EVANS: I respect the Court's ruling. 1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. MACY: Your Honor, I apologize for my 3 outburst. 4 (The following was said within the hearing of the 5 jury:) 6 MR. EVANS: I have no further questions of this 7 witness. 8 THE COURT: Any further from the State? 9 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes, Your Honor. 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. ELLIOTT: 12 Miss Gilchrist, Mr. Evans just asked you in reference 13 to Mr. Khepra -- I'm probably not pronouncing it correctly. 14 I'm referring to the person who's also known as Roderick 15 Wilson. I can say Wilson a little better. He asked you that 16 Mr. Wilson or Khepra had been eliminated because you had 17 found no hairs that were consistent with the hairs of Mr. 18 Khepra. I believe your response was "yes." 19 That's correct. 20 But you did find hairs that were consistent with 21 Robert Lee Miller. 22 I did. 23 Now, are you familiar with the term "transfer hairs?" 24 Α I am.

1 Can you explain to us what that is? 2 MR. EVANS: Judge, I object, because that's 3 beyond the scope of cross. 4 NR. ELLIOTT: Judge, he got into the fact 5 that --6 THE COURT: Overruled. 7 (By Mr. Elliott) You may answer. 8 Transfer hairs are hairs that are dropped from Okay. a body, the scalp or pubic area, that land on either clothing or chairs or floors and things like that or bedding, things 10 11 like that, that could be brought from one place -transferred from one place to another by an object or a 12 person. 13 14 So, if there's a hair in this chair and I sit in this chair and the hair adheres to my body, when I move over here, 15 I transfer that hair with me. 16 17 That's correct. 18 MR. EVANS: Objection as leading. 19 THE COURT: Please stand. 20 MR. EVANS: Objection as leading. 21 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions, Judge. 22 THE COURT: Any further cross-examination? 23 24 MR. EVANS: No, nothing further. 25 THE COURT: Thank you. You may stand down.

1 in the scientific community and that it would assist the 2 trier of fact. 3 I don't think they met their burden, and we would object to the evidence. 4 5 THE COURT: I would think that Frye, in logic, 6 it requires a prima facia showing, which has been made. 7 Then, of course, you may put on something in opposition to that, if you care to. I don't know that there's any magical 8 9 number of people the State must put on to meet the test. 10 I think what this witness has testified to is sufficient. 11 That will be my ruling. 12 MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Anything further? 13 14 MR. EVANS: No. 15 THE COURT: All right. 16 (Whereupon, the following transpired in open court, 17 the defendant personally present with counsel, counsel for the State present, and the jury in the 18 box:) 19 20 THE COURT: You're still testifying under oath, Miss Gilchrist. 21 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: The State needs to ask one or two 24 more questions, I think.

JOYCE GILCHRIST,

recalled as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 1 having been previously sworn, testified as follows: 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. ELLIOTT: Miss Gilchrist, as it became quite apparent awhile 5 ago, I handed you some evidence from the Fowler case, and 6 we're off that case. 7 MR. ELLIOTT: Now, I need to approach the 8 witness again, Your Honor, if I may. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 (By Mr. Elliott) I'll now hand you what's been marked 11 for identification purposes as State's Exhibits 128, 129, 12 130, 131, 132, and 133, and ask you to look at those, 13 please. Can you tell me what those are, please? 14 Again, these are cuttings from evidence that I took in 15 reference to the homicide. 16 And when you say "cuttings," those are the pieces that 17 you actually cut out of the exhibits such as shown in the 18 pillow, State's 87? 19 That's correct. 20 All right. How do you know those are the cuttings? 21 They bear my initials and my case number and 22 laboratory item numbers. 23 Okay. Did you have an occasion to send those to anyone for further analysis in this case?

24

I did. 1 2 Okay. When did you do that? 3 Approximately late September of 1987. 4 And to whom did you send them? 5 To Dr. Moses Schanfield in Atlanta, Georgia. 6 And what condition were those exhibits in when you sent them to Dr. Schanfield? 7 8 They were in a sealed and closed condition. 9 Now, I again hand you State's Exhibits 89A and 100, which have previously been introduced, and ask you if you 10 have had an occasion to send those to anyone? 11 12 I did. Okay. And to whom did you send those? 13 14 Dr. Moses Schanfield. 15 Again, what condition were those when you sent them to him? 16 17 They were in a sealed and closed condition. All right. 18 MR. EVANS: I've already seen them. 19 I have no objection to the introduction. 20 21 MR. ELLIOTT: We move admission of State's 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133. 22 23 THE COURT: Any objection?

No, sir.

They're all admitted.

MR. EVANS:

THE COURT:

MR. ELLIOTT: We have nothing further of the 1 witness, Judge. 2 THE COURT: Any questions of this witness? 3 MR. EVANS: No questions. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: You may call your next. 7 MR. MACY: May it please the Court. 8 IRVIN C. STONE, 9 called as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 10 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. MACY: 13 Will you state your name, please, sir? 14 Irvin C. Stone. 15 And what is your occupation or profession, sir? 16 I am the chief of the Physical Evidence Section at the 17 Institute of Forensic Sciences in Dallas. 18 And what is your educational background, sir? 19 I have a bachelor of science in geology from the Iowa 20 State University and a master of science and PhD in 21 geochemistry from the George Washington University. 22 What is your work experience, your experiential 23 background, sir? I was a special agent in the F.B.I. for six and a half 25

MR. MACY: She has been previously sworn. 1 2 Judge. 3 THE COURT: Yes. You're still testifying under 4 oath, Miss Gilchrist. 5 MR. MACY: May it please the Court. 6 JOYCE A. GILCHRIST, 7 recalled as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 8 having been previously sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MACY: 10 You're the same Joyce Gilchrist who testified earlier 11 12 in this proceeding? I am. 13 You're a forensic serologist for the Oklahoma City 14 15 Police Department: is that correct? 16 That's correct. 17 You previously testified that the semen donor had to be an "A" secretor and a PGM (1). What is the frequency in 18 the black and white population? 19 Okay. In the black population the frequency will be 20 approximately eight percent or one in 12 people. 21 22 white population the frequency will be approximately 19 23 percent or one in five people. Dr. Schanfield testified last Friday about allotypes. 24 25 How do allotypes relate to blood type and PGM?

blacks, 33 percent, or approximately .5 percent, one half of one percent, of the whites could be the donors of the markers that he tested for. What would be the combined frequency of "A" secretor, PGM (1), and these allotypes?

MR. EVANS: Your Honor, note my objections for the reasons stated in camera.

THE COURT: Yes. We'll so note. The record notes it.

All right,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q (By Mr. Macy) Again, what would be the frequency among the black and white population persons being type "A" secretor, PGM (1), with the allotypes that he testified about?
- A Okay. With those combined frequencies you'd expect about one in 36 blacks and about one in 1,000 whites.
- Q All right. You tested the blood of Robert Miller. Would Robert Miller, Jr.'s, secretions, seminal fluids and blood, fit in this group?

A It would, yes. 1 2 Q One out of 36? 3 That's correct. At the crime scene you testified that you found numerous short black hairs. 5 6 Correct. 7 As a forensic chemist what would this indicate to you? 8 It would indicate to me that the person did not take very good care of his hair, a lot of damage was prevalent. 9 You took samples of hair from the defendant; is that 10 11 correct? 12 I did, yes. What did you find the condition of his hair to be when 13 you took those samples? 14 It was not in very good shape. 15 What effect, if any, would wearing a cap have as far 16 17 as losing hairs, distributing hairs at a crime scene? It would limit or prohibit loss of a number of hairs. 18 In addition to the other tests and things that you've 19 talked about, did you run any additional tests in this case 20 forensically? 21 22 I did. And what was that?

I conducted a test called ortho-tolidine screen on the

23

24

25

body of

1	What was the purpose of that test?
2	A That was to in an effort to try to identify any
3	type of prints that may have been present on the body that
4	were not visible to the naked eye.
5	Q And did you obtain any results from that?
6	A I obtained an outline of a hand on the upper left
7	thigh area of Mrs. but no latent detail was seen.
8	Q Why did you run this test?
9	A To in an effort to try to determine or identify who
10	perpetrated this particular crime could have been.
11	MR. MACY: No further questions.
12	Your witness, counsel.
13	THE COURT: You may cross-examine.
14	MR. EVANS: I have no questions based on that.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. You may stand down.
16	Call your next, State.
17	You've testified before
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	THE COURT: and you're still testifying
20	under oath.
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	BILL CITTY,
23	recalled as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma,
24	having been previously sworn, testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION

135? It was submitted to Serology. 1 In what condition was it in? Since then it's been altered. It was in a sealed 3 condition when I submitted it. Okay. You mean by "altered" that the envelope's been opened. 6 Yes, sir; that's correct. 7 MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: You may cross-examine. 9 MR. EVANS: No questions, Judge. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. You may stand down. 11 Call your next, State. 12 MR. MACY: She's been previously sworn. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 You've been previously sworn and you're still 15 testifying under oath. 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 JOYCE A. GILCHRIST. 18 called as a witness on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, 19 having been previously sworn, testified as follows: 20 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ELLIOTT: 22 (,) Once again for the record, would you state your full 23 name? 24 My name is Joyce A. Gilchrist. 25

1	Q And you're the same Joyce Gilchrist that's testified
2	three or four times previously in this case.
3	A I am.
4	Q Okay. Now, Miss Gilchrist, I'd like to ask you in
5	your capacity as a forensic chemist for the Oklahoma City
6	Police Department if you received any evidence in reference
7	to a burglary occurring at 1813 Northwest 28th Street.
8	A I did.
9	Q And from whom and what date did you receive that?
10	A The evidence was submitted to our laboratory on
11	February 12th, 1987, by Specialist Ed Southard.
12	MR. ELLIOTT: May I approach the witness, Your
13	Honor?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	Q (By Mr. Elliott) I'll hand you what's been marked as
16	State's Exhibit Number 135 and ask you to examine this,
17	please. Can you tell me what that is?
18	A Yes, I can. It's an evidence envelope containing
19	hairs found at the point of entry at 1813 Northwest 28th
20	Street,
21	Q And what is contained inside that envelope?
22	A A white envelope that contained a bindle that
23	contained the hairs.
24	Q Okay. And how do you recognize those two particular

envelopes?

- Because they both bear my initials, case number and laboratory item number.
- O Okay. What condition were those envelopes when you received them?
  - A In a sealed and closed state.
- 6 Q After you received State's Exhibit 135 and what is 7 contained therein, what if anything did you do with that?
  - A I opened the envelope from the opposite end, removed the contents therein, gave an inventory number, and proceeded to do an examination on the hairs.
  - Q Okay. And when you say "examination," would that be an examination like the examination that you've previously gone through for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury?
    - A Forensic hair comparison, yes.
  - Q And with what did you compare the hairs contained in State's 135?
  - A With the hairs that have already been offered into evidence, State's exhibit numbers that have already been entered into evidence as hairs obtained from Robert Lee Miller.
  - Q Based upon that comparison did you arrive at any conclusions?
  - A I did.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 24 Q Could you tell me what those are, please?
- 25 A That two scalp hair fragments taken from the window

bottom frame are consistent microscopically with reference 1 hairs obtained from Robert Lee Miller, Jr.; therefore, these 2 hairs could have come from Miller. 3 MR. ELLIOTT: At this time, Your Honor, we'd move admission of State's 135. 5 THE COURT: Any objection? 6 MR. EVANS: No. sir. 7 THE COURT: It's admitted. 8 MR. ELLIOTT: No further questions. 9 THE COURT: You may cross-examine. 10 MR. EVANS: No questions. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 THE VITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: You may stand down. 14 May it please the Court. MR. MACY: 15 Comes now the State and moves to incorporate 16 all of the evidence from the first stage of this trial into 17 the second stage. 18 THE COURT: It will be done. 19 All evidence, members of the jury, that you've 20 already received in the first stage of this trial will be 21 before you for your consideration in this second stage. 22 MR. MACY: With that, Your Honor, the State 23 rests. 24

The State rests?

THE COURT: