1 you believe that confession was given freely and willfully and 2 on the basis of that consideration you are entitled, as jurors, 3 to give that statement as much weight or as little weight as you 4 deem appropriate. You saw Earl Washington. You heard him. 5 respectfully submit, and this is argument, that the Commonwealth's 6 assertion that Earl Washington claims that a conspiracy took 7 place among law enforcement officers is misplaced. Earl Washing-. 8 ton doesn't probably know what a conspiracy is. That's argument. 9 Those aren't facts. That's my presentation to you. You heard 10 the evidence, but you must consider all that you heard and all 11 that you observed in making your decision. This case is in your 12 hands where it properly belongs. You have to determine whether 13 or not Earl Washington ... Earl Washington has been proved quilty 14 beyond a reasonable doubt. You have to use your collective 15 experience and common sense in making that determination. 16 sure that you collectively and individually will do that and I'm 17 sure that you collectively and individually will return with a 18 decision as appropriate in consideration with the law and all of 19 the evidence in its entirety that you heard during the last day. 20 Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bennett?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BENNETT: Ladies and gentlemen, in regard to this question as to whether this statement was made by Mr. Washington, a statement made freely and voluntarily, I just ask you to recall these facts that before Investigator Wilmore and before Lt. Hart

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

14

10

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from the Town Police ever began talking with Mr. Washington ... of course, he made certain statements to Investigator Schrum from the Fauquier County Sheriff's Department, but before they ever began talking with him they, as you recall, Lt. Hart came over that Saturday afternoon, the defendant was asleep, they didn't make any attempt to talk to him at that time, let him get a good night's sleep, let him eat, do whatever he wanted to do, came back over the next morning and they didn't start talking with him until 10:00 that morning and you'll recall the testimony of Investigator Schrum of Fauquier that when the defendant came in that morning he was in much better spirits, he looked calm, fairly relaxed and he said, I had a good night's sleep. He was smiling about it. That was the investigator's testimony. was smiling and that I had a good night's sleep, it just wasn't quite long enough, and then the investigators came in, began talking with him. Is there one shred of evidence or any factual matter before you that this defendant was in any way forced to give this statement and was coerced into giving this statement ... is there any indication that these officers intimidated him, that he had been kept awake for days on end, badgered with different questions and accusations and threats against his family or other people or anything of that nature? There's not a shred of any evidence before you that these officers behaved in any other fashion than a fashion that was entirely appropriate. They just went in there and the defendant was there. They sat down and

23

24

25

they started talking. The defendant took them over to Culpeper and showed them where the actual apartment was where the act took place and I ask you to consider very carefully that the defendant ... there wasn't any coercion here, that at that point the defendant probably wanted to talk about this. You recall the testimony of Investigator Schrum that the defendant was there and his hands were shaking, he was obviously bothered or upset, and that as soon as he admitted, and apparently admitted for the first time, that he, in fact, killed that his hands stopped shaking and that he was relaxed and began crying at that point, and that he told the investigator that he felt better, that it had been some time during that whole time that he'd never told a single person what he had done and I ask you to ask yourselves in your own minds, is that the police forcing this man to talk, and coercing him, making him give an involuntary statement? All the police did in this case was ask him the questions and he gave them the answers, for whatever reasons he had in his mind, but the police were just doing their job and they didn't do anything improper. Now, as to the allegation or the assertion by the defendant that the police just made up everything that was testified to by them in the course of this trial, that in effect that they were lying, I ask you to consider how they would have gotten all the information about the defendant to put in a statement in the first place, about his age, about his education, the fact that he was living

1 with his sister and what his sister's name was, who he was 2 working for, all those various things, and I ask you to consider, 3 second of all, only a person who was actually there, who actually 4 did this, could have given them that statement, for several 5 reasons. He said that he kicked on the door, but the door was 6 What's the testimony of Special Agent Wilmore who was open. 7 there at the scene? There was no damage to the door. 8 apparently was, in fact, open. If the door had been locked or 9 closed there would have been some damage to the lock... asked 10 the defendant ... didn't suggest to him ... didn't ask him, 11 was the radio on? They asked him, was the radio on or off and the 12 defendant said the radio was on. What's the testimony of the 13 people there on the scene the day that this happened? When they 14 walked into the apartment there was a radio on. It was on FM 105. They asked the defendant to describe how it happened and what did 15 the defendant say? That he took 16 back bedroom and you'll recall the diagram of the house, the 17 18 bedroom was all the way at the end of the hall, the back bedroom in the apartment. How could anyone know that, except the person 19 who was there and the person who did it? The last piece of 20 evidence is that they asked him, did you take anything with you? 21 No, didn't take anything with me. Did you leave anything there? 22 Yes, I left a shirt. Why did you leave the shirt there? Because 23 it had blood on it, and what was found in the apartment, or later 24

found in the dresser that was removed from the apartment to the

25

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

mother-in-law's house, so she could separate the clothing and clothing and discard it and keep her son's take out There was a shirt and you heard the testimony of clothing? Kenny Buraker from the Town Police Department that when that shirt was handed over to him it had red spots on it that appeared to be bloodstains. You've heard the testimony that when they took that shirt back and held it up in front of the defendant he said, yes, that was the shirt I was wearing. They asked him, how do you know that was your shirt? Because the patch was missing over the left top pocket. Now, how does somebody make all that up, unless they were actually there and actually did it? I would submit to you that there can't be any question in your mind about it, the fact that this happened and the fact that Earl Washington Junior did it.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the case is about to be submitted to you on the question of guilt or innocence. When you retire to the jury room you should select a foreman from among your number who will preside over your deliberations and who will record the verdict, whatever it may be. Now in that regard I have written out on the back of the last instruction a form verdict which gives the jury two options of either finding the defendant not guilty or guilty as charged in the indictment and whichever of those verdicts is appropriate, it's up to the jury to select, once the decision has been made, and simply record it by having the foreman sign the verdict as reached.