
UNDISCLOSED SEASON 2: **THE STATE VS. JOEY WATKINS**

ADDENDUM 6: **THE CITY AND THE COUNTY**
POSTED: **AUGUST 18, 2016**

Dennis Robinson: Welcome, everyone, to the *Undisclosed Addendum* – a podcast about the podcast, *Undisclosed*. I am *obviously* not Jon Cryer, not as talented or well-known as Jon Cryer, but I am here, and I am hosting the *Addendum*. My name is Dennis Robinson and my official title for this enterprise known as *Undisclosed* is ‘Executive Producer’ but the truth of that is, that’s a title that Rabia made up for me so that I sound fancy, when all she really needed me to do was read ads about how good men’s underwear feels on my body – shout out Mack Weldon. In another life, I’m a judge advocate for the US Army, that basically means I get to show up in court with a bunch of colorful ribbons on my chest, but it does *not* mean that I know how to host an *Addendum*. Today, that is exactly what I’m doing. So, bear with me, folks. This might get bumpy. But hey, if it does, at least you’ll have a good time tweeting my epic fail on social media, and if you do, use the hashtag ‘*Undisclosed*’.

So as you know, *Undisclosed* second season is about the possible wrongful conviction of Joey Watkins, who has been incarcerated for more than a decade for a murder he allegedly committed in Rome, Georgia. This case was brought to us by the Georgia Innocence Project, and that provides the perfect segue into the introduction of today’s guests. So, saving my bacon this week we have Clare Gilbert of the Georgia Innocence Project – hello, Clare!

Clare Gilbert: Hello!

Dennis Robinson: We also have two of the *Undisclosed* crew with us today: That includes evidence professor and associate dean at the University of South Carolina School of Law – Professor Colin Miller joins us this week. Colin, I *cannot* well enough express how happy I am that you’re here. Maybe it’s because you’re a professor, but I feel like when I talk to you, I have to be on my best behavior and in my highest intellectual form, otherwise I’ll be sent out of the classroom. So, you keep me in line, sir, thanks for joining us today.

Colin Miller: Thanks for hosting, Dennis.

Dennis Robinson: And we’ve got the highly in-demand investigator, blogger, podcaster and attorney *extraordinaire*, from the Volkov Law Group who, we learned a couple of weeks ago apparently represents Klingons. Susan Simpson is here folks – Hi, Susan.

Susan Simpson: Hey!

Dennis Robinson: And finally, we have a special guest panelist – the wonderful Seema Iyer – Seema Iyer is a former criminal prosecutor, defense attorney, TV legal analyst and host of a great podcast called *The Bollywood Lawyer*. You can find *all* of Seema’s coverage of the Adnan Syed case on *The Bollywood Lawyer.com*. Hello, Ms Seema!

Seema Iyer: Hey, Dennis! You are doing a terrific job, my friend.

Dennis Robinson: Don’t build me up, ‘cause we’re going to find time to knock me down later.

- Seema Iyer:** [laughs]
- Susan Simpson:** [inaudible], Seema.
- Dennis Robinson:** Just let's see how it goes, huh?
- Seema Iyer:** You're doing good.
- Dennis Robinson:** Thank you, ma'am. Alright, so let's get started, folks. I'd like to open the podcast with how the episode opened, and that was on the subject of 'Jurisdiction Friction'. I hate it how cordial the police officer made the jurisdiction battle sound. I was hoping for something much more dramatic, and southern, between the respective police departments, like, a fiddler's duel, from 'The Devil Went Down To Georgia', or something.
- Colin I'll pass this off to you. Can you talk a little bit more about the concept of jurisdiction friction? And you know, how it came to be on TV, and maybe where else we've seen it play out?
- [03:28]
- Colin Miller:** Well, yeah, I mean, the matter of jurisdiction is complicated – especially in the increasingly interconnected world, where you can have a victim who lives in one city, a defendant who lives in another. If there's a conspiracy there can be planning, and you could, therefore, have multiple jurisdictions that could lay claim to a case. And oftentimes, as we've said, sometimes it's a hot potato where no one wants to handle it, sometimes it's a high-profile case where each jurisdiction wants to handle it, and that can create issues, when you have these warring jurisdictions – each either trying to lay claim or *not* lay claim to the case.
- Dennis Robinson:** Well sadly, for entertainment purposes for the podcast, it doesn't sound like there was much of a war between Rome Police Department and Floyd County. But, I'll go to Seema, who, being a former ADA who worked The Bronx, I imagine that you've seen some more vicious jurisdiction fiction play out, is that right?
- Seema Iyer:** Sure! Definitely. And as a prosecutor, you usually want to keep the case, because you *so much* want to see this person in jail, and you want to prosecute it. And it's also a *lot* of an ego battle, I think, with prosecutors. Now, in New York, the problem is always between the states and the 'Feds', and I see this more, actually, in Manhattan – because in Manhattan, the district attorneys, they all think they're as smart and as powerful as the Feds. But they're not, and a lot of times the Feds try to take *their* cases. So... I've seen *that* play out a lot.
- And another issue, which I've seen, is when someone commits a crime in different states. So, I don't know if you all remember, there was a famous fashion designer, Anand Jon. And he committed various rapes and sexual assaults across the country. I represented him for a short time, and New York wanted him, Los Angeles wanted him, Texas wanted him – *everybody* wanted him. So, that's another way you see it play out.
- Dennis Robinson:** Interesting. I want to ask the southern folks here – specifically Susan and Clare – about how the battle, well, the *lack* of a battle between Rome and Floyd county played out. You know, we heard in the podcast that Rome started the investigation, for all intents and purposes, Joey was not a suspect, then when Stanley Sutton picked it up at Floyd County, Joey's all of a sudden Suspect Number One. You said in the podcast that it didn't *seem* like there was much of a battle, but it was a little bit there. I mean was that, like a southern hospitality or respect thing? Or was something going *on* behind the scenes? I mean, what did we *not* hear on the podcast that you can maybe lend some background info to?

[05:55]

Clare Gilbert:

I can, probably, speak to this a bit – this is Clare – while there may be a lack of a battle on the surface, there is definitely some jurisdiction friction between Rome Police Department and Floyd County Police Department. I think it's not just about this case. My sense of a long-running, sustained friction between the two, and various different cultures between the two. For example, in Rome Police Department, they pride themselves on the fact that they have many different certifications, they have all kinds of external oversight that they work hard to comply with – outside people coming in, looking in on the police department, and they really consider themselves to be very 'above board'. And, my sense – which came, kind of under the surface, and speaking with different people, but also people have told me this *directly* – that Floyd County Police Department is not as *by-the-book* as Rome Police Department considers itself to be.

The fact that there *is* a friction, which is clearly present, between the two agencies, I think is uncomfortable for the agencies. I've heard through someone that Detective Moser had a big concern that this podcast would just try to play off the tension between these two police departments, and that he did not want that to be the case. So I thought that that was really interesting, and that may play into this whole 'southern hospitality' thing, or the fact the they're literally one floor apart from each other and they see each other all the time.

It may be that there was more friction in the past, and they're working to overcome that, and have things be more smooth between them now. But it is, and continues to be, an interesting dynamic between the two.

Dennis Robinson:

That is very interesting. So, are you suggesting that he is trying to conceal what is, in actuality, friction between the two departments? Or he's afraid that we're going to exacerbate it for the sake of drama on the podcast?

Clare Gilbert:

The latter.

Susan Simpson:

[in unison] The latter.

[laughter]

Clare Gilbert:

I don't think he's trying to conceal it. He's been upfront about the fact that Rome Police Department did not make the arrest in this case, they did not issue the warrants in this case. I think... Yeah. As was discussed in the podcast, it becomes clear that Rome, not only in the podcast but throughout Detective Moser's very extensive notes, his investigation was leading in a different direction, and when it turned out that not only was Joey arrested by Floyd County, but that Moser ended up being the key State's police witness. And it was mainly Rome Police Department witnesses who testified against Joey, at Joey's trial. My sense of that is that it made them uncomfortable.

Dennis Robinson:

Now, I mean I get where he's coming from. Being a government worker myself. But at the same time, it's not like we're producing *Days of our Lives* or anything. We don't try to play up drama in this podcast. Colin, Rabia and Susan do an exceptional job of researching and just trying to keep it on the level, so I think his concern's a bit misplaced.

Susan Simpson:

Obviously they have the very rational, understandable, self-interest of not wanting to have workplace tensions be increased, but the reality is that there is an awkward dynamic between the two departments. And it's not a comfortable one. And I think you can see, it's not always a productive one. As in how it played out in Joey's case.

Dennis Robinson: I was struck in the episode by how quickly the tide seemed to turn when the Rome Police Department passed it off to Floyd County. I mean, I just imagine, considering how much work that Detective Moser put in, that all of a sudden Floyd County picks this up and seems to go in an entirely different direction. That Rome Police Department would've got a little bit chafed by that. It just didn't sound like that in the podcast, you know?

Susan Simpson: I wouldn't say it was a *different* direction, because it was the same direction Moser had already gone down. It's just he reached a different conclusion.

Dennis Robinson: One of the things that led to that conclusion that struck me as a bit strange, was the finding of the shell casing. Susan, correct me if I'm wrong, but it sounds like they found the shell casing about 920 feet from where the wreck occurred, is that right?

Susan Simpson: They found it 366 feet south of the profile sign, which is-- I think it's about 500 yards south of the wreck. So, about 900 altogether.

Dennis Robinson: And Detective Jackson said that you know, it seems like far away, but it's actually not that far away when you're driving 60 miles an hour. But, still thinking about that, that just seems like a heck of a distance to shoot somebody, and then have the car travel that far before it runs off the road. Were you guys struck by that distance? I mean, does it sound credible to you?

Susan Simpson: Well that's a short distance. If that's the distance then it's shorter than what we initially thought – at least that I thought.

Dennis Robinson: What did you initially think?

Susan Simpson: I now think that they found where the car crossed over, but I'm still not entirely sure where that was.

Dennis Robinson: Yeah, that came up a lot. It sounded like there were theories as to where and how the car crossed over, but there was no real good forensic evidence that was indicative, is that right?

[11:06]

Clare Gilbert: That's right. I mean, as discussed in the podcast, when we first started reading the transcripts and then when we talked to Wayne Benson, he has this very vivid memory of the truck veering off to the left and then basically riding along in the median for quite a ways before then crossing back over the median and continuing quite a ways northbound in the southbound lane, before it ultimately drifted off to the left, scraped up alongside the guardrail, and then ultimately one or two tires went up over the guardrail, which caused the truck to flip.

So, when we first started this, our sense was that there was a long distance between where the truck first crossed the road and where it actually crashed. It was really only with Lee Carter's testimony that we got a better sense of how close the police may have believed that the truck was when it crossed, in relation to the shell casing. And I have listened to Lee Carter's testimony, and read it over and over and I, honestly, cannot make heads or tails of what he's saying. I just find it very odd that he's got this draft or, a rough sketch, of an accident reconstruction and that was never provided to the police and never turned over at trial, and even though it was referenced at trial it is not a trial exhibit.

So I just don't understand why it never made it in the police file, never made it in the DA's file, and never made it in the court's file after trial. And his long pauses, I'm not sure if he's confused, or can't remember, or is just uncomfortable with the answers he's giving.

Dennis Robinson:

I want to pick up on that, and I want to talk more about Benson and the various interviews with him, but first we've got to take a break.

Folks, Colin and I are going to talk to you about underwear, and we'll be right back.

[14:44]

≈

Dennis Robinson:

So I definitely want to return to Benson, just because I find his role in this interesting. I have two questions: The first might be a dumb question, but bear with me. Is he still alive? Have you guys tried to talk to him?

Seema Iyer:

Ooh, good question, Dennis!

Clare Gilbert:

He *is* still alive. And we have spoken with him on the phone and in person.

Susan Simpson:

Yeah, that's going to be next episode, actually.

Dennis Robinson:

Okay, teaser... Perfect.

Seema Iyer:

Ooh...

Dennis Robinson:

Alright, so, the other question I wanted to ask about him was how come they went to Benson so many times then, and why did his statement evolve over time? And I mean, are we talking about, like a '*Jay Wilds* evolved over time' series of statements, or something less serious?

Clare Gilbert:

Well, I think that they went to him so many times because he was the only legitimate eyewitness. He was the only actual eyewitness in the case. When he first spoke with police at the crime scene, he apparently gave very little information about anything – if any. There's no documentation that he gave any information about what he had witnessed prior to the wreck occurring. And over time, he gave more and more and more information, and it did evolve. And that may be because, I think he was just really trying to rack his brain and remember what he saw.

You know, he saw this event, and at the time he was seeing it he just didn't think much of it. He thought maybe it was a spat between two people and I think maybe he didn't link that event and the car going off of the road until he got the call from Detective Moser asking him questions. And after that, I think he was just pushing his memory as far as he could take it, and wanting to give information that would be helpful, when really, those memories just aren't there.

Dennis Robinson:

I see. So if I heard this right, Rome Police Department talked to him very, very often, but when Floyd County picked it up, he seemed to be less important, because Floyd County wanted to see Tandi's car, and he wasn't telling them that he was seeing Tandi's car. Is that right?

Clare Gilbert:

Well, I'm not sure that's completely accurate, in that Rome spoke with him probably five or six different times. They all seem to be small conversations – brief – where he would maybe

remember that perhaps there was a fin on the car, or maybe that the car had four doors, or that it might have had sporty wheels – various bits of information. One of the things he remembered is that there was maybe a muzzle flash. At first he thought that that was just some dust that had been kicked up when the car left the road. And I'm sure they'll get more into that, next episode. And then, you had asked, "What happened with Floyd County?" And ultimately what came out, the testimony at trial, I think the State was trying *not* to lean very heavily on Wayne Benson or his testimony, but Floyd County did also interview Wayne Benson, and it was a Detective Reeps who had interviewed him. And didn't get any more information out of him different that what the Rome Police Department had gotten out of him, but they did follow up with him and interview him that one time.

Dennis Robinson:

Okay. Interesting. Colin, where did this white Cutlass come from and who is John? I completely missed it and I don't know if that's because my attention deficit caught up with me or what, but it seemed like John and the white Cutlass came out of nowhere. What is this theory about?

Colin Miller:

Yeah, there are these two witnesses who were driving south on Highway 27 and Isaac was driving north, and they reported seeing, in the vicinity of the car crash, this white Cutlass, and Susan might know a little bit more than myself.

Apparently at the scene someone mentioned that the driver was named John. He might have been interviewed by someone. And there the story where a piece of the truck, or it might have been the bullet, striking this white Cutlass. But beyond those broad strokes, we don't have much in the way of specifics about this white Cutlass at the scene.

Susan Simpson:

Both the southbound witnesses-- Or both the *identified* southbound witnesses, that we know of and have names for, mentioned that this white Cutlass driver had something crack his windshield – hit his windshield – during the time of the wreck. But we don't know anything else.

Dennis Robinson:

It's just so interesting. It seemed like a piece of information that reflects a bunch of other pieces of information you guys have gleaned in this case. And that's basically, somebody heard someone say something and *knows* somebody, but in terms of documentation, in terms of the investigation, it's just lacking.

Colin Miller:

And, Susan and Clare, I think this is right, right? Wayne Benson never mentions a white Cutlass being on the scene. Right?

Susan Simpson:

Yeah. But he didn't really talk to the others. He was more there to do a job, then left. He was not really being social with the other witnesses.

Clare Gilbert:

But what was interesting was, with the other witnesses, I believe it was in the notes one of the officers made during a conversation with Tammy Penny. She said that John, the driver of the Cutlass, had spoken with the officers at the scene... The same officer who spoke with Tammy Penny. But we don't have any documentation of that.

Dennis Robinson:

Interesting. And when it comes to the shell casing coming up and cracking the white Cutlass, I know Officer Hank Jackson tried to explain that to you...? Was that him theorizing on the spot, like, in an interview with you guys? Or is this something that they had considered at the time of the investigation?

[20:03]

- Clare Gilbert:** I did that interview, and my sense was that that was definitely just hypothetical theorizing on the spot. That is not something that he had thought about prior to that interview.
- Susan Simpson:** Though, Clare had an interesting theory this morning, hadn't thought about before – about what might have hit the Cutlass.
- Dennis Robinson:** Ooh... Do you want to reveal here?
[laughter]
- Seema Iyer:** We're all waiting with baited breath!
- Dennis Robinson:** Seriously.
- Clare Gilbert:** Well, I was thinking it might have been the laptop that flew out of Isaac's truck, because--
- Seema Iyer:** Ooh.
- Dennis Robinson:** [sings] *Dun-dun-duuun...*
[laughter]
- Clare Gilbert:** Because, Wayne Benson said that he-- My memory of my conversation with Wayne Benson – it was not a recorded interview, so I went back and looked at my notes today – was that Wayne Benson had said that as he crossed the median and the southbound lane to approach the wreck, he found a computer on the road. And picked it up and brought it over to where the crash site was. I had a memory that someone else had said that as well, but in looking over my notes, it says that he found the computer in the grass, right at the edge of the road. So my memory was wrong there, I think.
- Dennis Robinson:** Miss Gilbert, time out.
- Clare Gilbert:** [laughs]
- Dennis Robinson:** So, I went and listened to all of the *Undisclosed* episodes twice to prep for this, obviously because I am nervous out of my mind--
- Clare Gilbert:** [laughs]
- Dennis Robinson:** And someone, please correct me if I'm wrong, but has there been any talk on finding a laptop on the side of the road at the accident? That seems completely random to me.
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah, me too. I don't remember that.

- Susan Simpson:** I don't think we've talked about it yet. It was a laptop, it was in his car, it belonged to Floyd College... I think the first I heard of it was when Mr Benson told us that he picked it up. So he's going over to the truck and he sees something on the ground and he wants to make sure no one steps on it during all the rescue efforts, so he picks it up and puts it in the back of Isaac's truck.
- Dennis Robinson:** What is going on?! Did that pop up on, like, a evidence list? Or did anybody look at the laptop? Or anything like that?
- Susan Simpson:** All we know from the records is that Floyd College did take possession of a laptop from the police, but that's it.
- Dennis Robinson:** Well, so, I get finding a shell casing, and seeing how that's possibly connected to the shooting, but I also think that if you find a laptop on the side of the road, that could give you better information about the location where the car went off the road, where the possible shooting happened, you know? Things like that.
- Susan Simpson:** Well Benson had moved it before the police got there. So...
- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah...
- Seema Iyer:** But did they ever analyze the computer?
- Susan Simpson:** No.
- Seema Iyer:** The hard drive? Nothing?
- Susan Simpson:** No.
- Dennis Robinson:** Wow.
- Seema Iyer:** Ooh.
- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah.
- Seema Iyer:** That *is* interesting.
- Susan Simpson:** I wish we had Isaac's emails, too. So, we have two screenshots of his, like, email list, but we don't see the contents.
- Colin Miller:** Yeah, it's similar to the first season case where Hae's computer was taken in and there was a request to search it, but apparently it was returned to the family. And another source of information here, where this laptop just – as far as we know – was not searched for recent activity.

- Clare Gilbert:** There's that disc, that they searched – where was that floppy disc? Was that in the laptop bag or was that at Isaac's home?
- Susan Simpson:** They did not record that. The laptop may-- I think it was actually issued by Floyd College, so it might not have that much on it. But those screenshots of Isaac's emails are maddening. Because for a *lot* of stuff in this case, we don't know dates. We've tried to sort of reverse-engineer when stuff happened, but if this stuff was happening to Isaac you'd *think* he'd email a friend and tell them – tell anyone. Tell someone. Using these emails is a way that, theoretically, the officers could have reconstructed what had happened between him and Joey, or him and others...
- Dennis Robinson:** I would imagine that too. And we'll hear more about this later, when it comes to Isaac and the 'doggy' side, but Isaac's thoughts about Joey at the time of the shooting seem integral to this case. Because it speaks to, you know, any possible positives in their relationships as they developed. And I would think that some of the emails might say that. Right?
- Susan Simpson:** That's what we want to know! [laughs]
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah!
- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah. Yeah. I would think it was huge. Seema, I'm going to put you on the spot here: As it pertains to looking at this investigation out of small town Rome, Georgia, and how it compares to some of the investigations that you've seen and helped to prosecute as an ADA. So what do you think about how Rome and Floyd County did in this case?
- Seema Iyer:** I think the problem is – and this is so similar to Adnan Syed's case – it's a 'wag the dog' situation. They found their suspect, *then* they found the evidence. And then they tailored all the evidence and tried to fit it to the suspect. But, I don't even see a good motive here. There's no strong motive, there's no evidence – I'm baffled. I really am baffled.
- I think, it is a small town investigation in the sense that everybody knows everybody, and so that really plays into it. So, they almost have more weight in presenting witnesses as *fact* witnesses – character witnesses – when in actuality they are hearsay witnesses. And some of their testimony should not have been allowed at trial. So, I think it was a poorly done investigation, but not as bad as Adnan Syed's case. And I think in one episode Susan even says, you didn't have a huge problem with the investigation?
- Susan Simpson:** I don't have a huge problem-- Well, it's not that-- I think that in many respects, the Rome Police Department did a good job of following leads. They didn't just-- I mean, in Adnan's case... *What* other suspects? – That's not a thing.
- Here*, if something came up – if a lead came in – if they had something to pursue, they're like, "Well, that sounds kind of weird, let's check it out". And that's the Rome Police only.
- Clare Gilbert:** They--
- Seema Iyer:** They tried to fit everything to pin it on Joey.
- Susan Simpson:** Not necessarily. Not the Rome Police.

- Clare Gilbert:** From my perspective, I thought Detective Moser did a very, very good job.
- Colin Miller:** Right.
- Clare Gilbert:** He's got over 100 pages of notes. They're really quite fascinating to read, because, he would get a tip in, and then *instantly*, you could see, over the next several pages of notes, he would follow that lead, and push, and push, and push, and push. And go all the way down to the bottom of the rabbit hole until that lead died out.
- Colin Miller:** Right.
- Seema Iyer:** Wow.
- Clare Gilbert:** And then he'd get *another* tip in, and he would do the same thing, over, and over, and over again. I mean, there are a couple areas where I am just baffled that he did not investigate more where he could have, and I'm sure that will come up later in the podcast.
- I think he might have maybe misjudged, or made some assumptions, and shut a door prematurely – especially in one particular area – but for the *most* part, he really did a very, very good investigation, and then when you see Moser's investigation ends and the next thing you look at in our ream of documents is the *Floyd County* investigation, it's just very strikingly different. Because, like Susan and Colin and Rabia said, it was just: *Joey-Joey-Joey-Joey-Joey*. There's no pursuing leads.
- Seema Iyer:** Okay, and didn't Moser eventually say Joey didn't do it?
- Seema Iyer:** Wasn't there some letter of recommendation, or something?
- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah.
- Seema Iyer:** And where's the letter?
- Clare Gilbert:** Well, that's the interesting thing--
- [laughter]
- Seema Iyer:** Jesus!
- Clare Gilbert:** Because we don't have the letter! You heard the audio--
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah.
- Clare Gilbert:** From the episode, and then his trial attorney did confirm for me that there *was* indeed, a letter, and that it was written at the trial attorney's request, because Joey was being denied the ability to get a job – because it was showing up on his record that he was a suspect in this case. I'm not *quite* sure how that could be, but that's what we were told.

Seema Iyer: But--

Clare Gilbert: A--

Seema Iyer: I'm sorry, but was the letter brought into trial? Or not?

Clare Gilbert: No.

Seema Iyer: No?

Clare Gilbert: We have never seen the letter.

Seema Iyer: Did Detective Moser testify at trial about the letter?

Clare Gilbert: No!

Colin Miller: No!

Clare Gilbert: And Detective Moser--

Seema Iyer: Why?

Clare Gilbert: We did not know about the letter until just very recently, and I asked Detective Moser about it, and he has no recollection of--

Seema Iyer: But at the *time*, the trial attorneys knew!

Colin Miller: Mm-hmm.

Clare Gilbert: Right.

Seema Iyer: So, the trial attorneys... Why-- Do you *know*, why? I don't want to assume, but they ask him, "Hey, did you write a letter of recommendation for my client?"

Susan Simpson: Seema--

Seema Iyer: Yeah?

Susan Simpson: That's the same reaction we had.

[laughter]

[28:00]

Colin Miller: Right. But Seema, yeah. I mean, it would be the *first thing* – if you were defense counsel you’d raise an opening statement, and the last thing you’d end with in closing is to say, “They investigated this for *seven weeks* and their conclusion is, “We ruled him out as a suspect in the case – there’s no way he committed this crime.”

And, I have *no idea* how this was not brought up at trial.

Dennis Robinson: Colin, you’re being *way* more respectful of how defense counsel should have handled it. If I was up there, I would have took the damn letter and taken out a nail and hammer and just *banged* it right on the wall.

Seema Iyer: But Dennis, do we *know* if the letter existed at the *time*?

Susan Simpson: So, again, we only learned of it’s existence, because the Floyd County Police mentioned it during an interview with Joey’s then-girlfriend.

And Clare had talked to the trial attorneys and they had said, like, “Yeah, we had one. I don’t know where it is now.” That’s all we know!

Colin Miller: But it must have been before Joey was arrested, because--

Susan Simpson: Oh yeah.

Colin Miller: He was applying for a job--

Seema Iyer: Right. Exactly!

Colin Miller: Yeah. So, it’s clearly before trial.

Seema Iyer: Was it entered as an exhibit? Was it--

Susan Simpson: No! No-no-no-no. It had nothing-- It never appears again.

Seema Iyer: Okay. Never appears at the trial?

Susan Simpson: No.

Dennis Robinson: Maddening.

Seema Iyer: Did the *judge* get a copy of it?

Susan Simpson: [laughs] No. It went away. Joey used it to get a job in Adairsville, and that’s it. It disappears entirely.

Dennis Robinson:

Like so much in this case.

I wanted to go back to a difference that I noticed in the investigation, between Rome Police Department and Floyd County. And that was the treatment of Brianne. I think you guys did a really good job, and I'm referencing Clare's earlier comment here, that, you know, Moser seemed pretty thorough about the things he was thorough about. I mean, obviously he missed a few leads, and obviously you wish he would have dug down deeper on things like, you know, the letter, but other stuff he seemed to do a pretty good job.

But then when Floyd County picked it up, it seemed like their well, the well they kept tapping was the 'well' that is *Brianne*. And he just kept going back to her, over and over, and relying on everything that she said.

Was Moser as intense about, like, relying on Brianne as Sutton was?

Susan Simpson:

Yeah. So we don't actually have *any* formal interviews done between Brianne and the Rome Police Department. We know that Moser talked to her. He had phone calls with her, and he wrote down notes from it, and it's hard to tell just from the notes, but I definitely don't get a sense that Moser was taking everything that Brianne said as gospel.

Clare Gilbert:

I would definitely agree with that. And I also thought, one *other* document is very interesting, and I almost wonder if this might be the document that people are thinking of in terms of a letter...? But it's clearly written by Debbie Burnett – who was then, Lieutenant Debbie Burnett – and *not* Detective Moser. But it's basically her summary of the case to date, and unfortunately it is not dated, so we don't know when she wrote it--

Seema Iyer:

[sighs]

Clare Gilbert:

But it is quite far into the investigation, based on the substance of it. But there is a paragraph in there that I just wanted to briefly read, because it's totally relevant to what we're talking about, and it says, "During this time, we" – being the Rome Police Department:

During this time we followed numerous leads and investigated each as they were presented to us. These leads included phone calls from jail inmates, stating they knew about the incident.

All of these leads proved to be attempts to bargain to be released from jail. And the exception to this was when contact was made with Mark Free. He was transported from the Floyd County Jail to the Rome Police Department for an interview. Detective Moser conducted this interview. At that time, no convicting evidence was obtained from Free.

And at that point the memo shifts into Floyd County Police Department getting on, and Rome Police Department then just playing a supportive assistant role where they really didn't do much at all after that. And--

Susan Simpson:

Downplaying everything that they did.

Clare Gilbert:

When I first read this, I was like, "Whoa...!" They definitely did not think that Joey or Mark is guilty.

And if you look at Moser's notes pertaining to that interview with Mark Free, his comments down at the bottom really make it seem like he really believes Mark, and that Mark wasn't involved in this.

Susan Simpson: Yeah, I call that letter the 'CYA' letter – Debbie Burnett.

Dennis Robinson: I just wish he would've gave that sense when he testified at trial. To me it seemed, like, almost the complete opposite – he was at least equivocating, you know, when it came to Joey's involvement, and that was frustrating.

Susan Simpson: Not equivocating – he was fully supporting the prosecution's theory.

Dennis Robinson: Yeah.

Clare Gilbert: Yeah. Oh yeah. And my sense in talking with him was that that made him uncomfortable.

Dennis Robinson: Yeah, I imagine.

Ok folks, we're going to take a quick break right here to let you know how you can get Rabia's book for free on Audible. When we come back we will answer some social media questions, talk about the murder of Sally, the dog, and one of our panelists has a background in animal cruelty prosecution. Who is it? You'll find out on the other end of the break.

[34:13]

≈

Dennis Robinson: Okay folks, welcome back to the *Undisclosed Addendum*. Now, before the break I hinted that someone on our panel has a specialization in the prosecution of folks who commit horrendous animal cruelty. Folks on the panel, I open the floor to you. Who wants to step up and take credit for that distinction?

Seema Iyer: It's *me-e!* Hello!

Dennis Robinson: Hello, Seema.

Seema Iyer: From The Bronx! Yeah. I was very fortunate to be one of two prosecutors who handled prosecutions against those who committed crimes against animals. There was a much senior DA, and really her entire practice in The Bronx DA's office was devoted to that. And I'm very grateful for that experience. I'm definitely an animal rights activist, and very passionate...

However, looking at this case, I don't think Joey had anything to do with this. He says he didn't have anything to do with this. I believe the victim said he had nothing to do with this, and what bothers me is *how in the heck* this got in front of a jury.

Dennis Robinson: Mm-Hmm.

Seema Iyer: So my question to the team, including Clare of course, is: Did the defense attorneys *know* that this prior bad act was going to come in? And if so, did they do a motion to preclude?

- Susan Simpson:** Well, Seema, to back up one moment, I guess. We know that *Brianne* said that Isaac said that he didn't think that Joey killed his dog. But in terms of the police record, that's as far as it goes.
- Seema Iyer:** Okay.
- [35:56]
- Dennis Robinson:** Well Colin, you've got some interesting information about Joey's state of mind as it came to working with animals, right?
- Colin Miller:** Yeah. I had a couple of things I wanted to mention: Seema, in response to your question, and we'll discuss this in more detail when we get to the trial, but it was basically a 'conditional relevance' situation. That's covered by Rule 104(b) of the Rules of Evidence, where essentially the State's claim is: "We have a fact – his dog was killed". The relevance, if Joey killed the dog, obviously that proves his motive and his bad faith and his intent to harm Isaac.
- And the conditional fact-- When they presented the evidence initially they didn't *have* it, and it was a 'subject to admission' – meaning they needed connecting-up evidence to come later.
- And when we get to the trial we'll discuss exactly what happened with that. But it was something where, I think, the State promised a lot more than they could provide.
- Seema Iyer:** And the jury heard it!
- Colin Miller:** Mm-hmm.
- Seema Iyer:** And so it was subject to connection but it was never connected.
- I am *livid* over this issue. I think exactly what you said in the last episode: One of you said that it's like the minute the jury heard about this, they were *done*. They were turned off. He had *no* chance after that. This is *unbelievable* that the jury heard this. *Unbelievable*. They should have gotten a frigging *mistrial*.
- But, go ahead.
- Colin Miller:** That is definitely something we'll delve into, and we'd love to have you back.
- And, then, yeah. Following up, Dennis, to get back to your point. I'd been emailing back and forth with Clare, because I'd remembered a conversation – we were down in Rome – about Joey seeking a transfer to the Al Burruss Prison in Georgia. And essentially, Dennis, the situation is this: That recently Joey had requested a transfer to the Al Burruss Prison in Georgia, and they have what's known as the 'Vision Program'. And it allows inmates the chance to raise guide dogs, taking also, simultaneously, classes to get Veterinary Helper certificates from Central Georgia Technical College. But, some complications have arisen, so he hasn't got that, but it's our understanding that Joey very much wanted to take part in this program because of his love for animals, and dogs specifically.
- Seema Iyer:** I think what's relevant about Joey's intention is also, I understand, Colin – at least from your email – that the conversation that Clare had with Joey was *way* prior to this podcast. So I think that--
- [crosstalk]

- Colin Miller:** Right. So you're talking about the optics of it, right?
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah! Yeah.
[crosstalk]
- Colin Miller:** Maybe trying to do PR...?
- Seema Iyer:** Right.
- Colin Miller:** This was *well* before we came on the scene that he had this interest in entering this program.
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah--
[crosstalk]
- Susan Simpson:** Colin and I had a discussion about this too. Because, Joey loves dogs. There's no factual dispute about that.

But at the same time, I think it's possible for someone who loves dogs, in general, and wants to work with them, to have theoretically done something to hurt or kill a dog in revenge. Under the right circumstances.
- Seema Iyer:** Oh, I agree, right! Like, I love people, but I could kill people, too. Why not?
[laughter]
- Seema Iyer:** You're absolutely right. But Susan, I have to say, there's something about that clip in the last episode of Joey talking about the dog. That, I don't know why – because you know, I always feel like I don't believe anybody. But for some reason, in his voice, the way he answered you... I immediately thought that this kid didn't do it. He had nothing to do with this.
- Dennis Robinson:** I've been pulling that from the whole podcast – like every time I hear Joey talk – and I guess it goes all the way back to his *sentencing*. It's like, this guy does not have it-- At least in his voice – from what you hear on the podcast – doesn't have it in his soul to kill the person he was prosecuted for killing.
- Susan Simpson:** One interesting thing that's come up is that again, and we'll get into more of this about the trial, but the evidence linking Joey to the dog's death is... 'Thin' is generous.

There's that one witness who, at one point, says Joey said that he killed the dog, but at trial he's already recanted.

And there's nothing in the police notes and the police file that actually connects Joey to this dog's death. For the Rome Police's file. It's just not there. And based on that, you'd assume there *was* nothing.

Actually, just this weekend I did, however, find a witness who the cops never spoke to, the prosecution never spoke to, but he's the first person I've ever spoken to who confirmed that Isaac did tell him, at one unknown point, that he thought that Joey might have killed his dog.

So we're not sure *why* or *if* he told Brianne about him *not* thinking Joey did it, but he did apparently tell someone else that the cops never spoke to. So this is not something they had in their file anyway.

But it's a confusing situation. It's hard to know what went on.

Seema Iyer: Even if it *was* a prior conviction, even if there was a certificate of conviction. Even *then*, there would have to be some type of hearing on its admissibility at trial...

Colin Miller: Mm-hmm.

Seema Iyer: On the people's case, or if Joey testified. And even then! Wouldn't the prejudice outweigh any probative value?

Susan Simpson: I should back up.

See, *I'm* the one jumping to conclusions here. Because that witness never said that Isaac thought *Joey* killed his dog.

The witness said that Isaac had told him, that *some guy* he was having a problem with over a girlfriend – he thought *he* might have hurt his dog.

Seema Iyer: God...

Dennis Robinson: Right. So, to clarify this for me and the listeners, it sounds like the sole source of information that Isaac believed that Joey had killed his dog was the infamous Brianne. Am I reading that right?

Susan Simpson: It's hard to know what the source is now, 'cause the only reference to the dog in the Rome Police notes is from Brianne saying that he *didn't* think it happened.

Seema Iyer: And if we don't know the source, it's not reliable!

Colin Miller: Yeah.

Seema Iyer: And if it's not reliable, it shouldn't go in front of a jury.

Susan Simpson: Wait, you mean that jailhouse snitch that says he heard about it, isn't reliable?

Seema Iyer: Oh, geez...

Colin Miller: The problem with this too, is the media coverage is all wrong.

So if you look online, there's an article where it says Mark Free admitted to killing the dog and that wasn't in evidence at all, yet somehow the press has that in one of the articles.

Dennis Robinson: Yeah, I don't know. I mean, I feel like I'm emotionally wrapped-up in the case, obviously, from listening to it. But when I heard Brianne giving another piece of information that seemed to implicate Joey, my heart dropped.

Just because it seems like *so* much of this case, and not just the 'bad character' stuff, but the stuff that seems to connect Joey directly to Isaac's shooting... Like the fact that Adam and Joey went down and bought a handgun in Cedartown. *That* came from Brianne. It just seems, all to connect back to *her*. And... I don't know.

And is that the impression that you feel is just coming out on the podcast by virtue of how we record it and produce it? Or is that really what it comes down to? I mean, does the evidence really come down to what Brianne was able to provide to Sutton?

Susan Simpson: That's an over-simplification, but it's not *wrong*, necessarily. Because it's really... A lot of the time, a lot of this stuff – you go back to the original source, and yes – it goes back to Brianne.

But at the same time, I think that's why Brianne's comments to Moser are so relevant – because if *she* is saying that Joey didn't do something bad... I'm inclined to give that more credit, just because she finds any excuse she can, just to say Joey did something bad.

Dennis Robinson: I tell you what, how about we knock out some social media questions from our fans. Does that sound good, guys?

Seema Iyer: It sounds like a slice of heaven.

[laughter]

[42:20]

Dennis Robinson: Perfect. So, here we go: 'The Real Dan Martin' asks, "Given all the evidence testimony Joey gave to the Police that would later be used against him, does your team have advice for people dealing with police in situations where you may be the subject of an investigation?"

Seema, I think that's a natural one for you, given your defense background.

Seema Iyer: I think you *never* speak to the police without consulting with a lawyer. Or at least having a lawyer present. I think that's the first thing.

Dennis Robinson: Boom! That's easy. Get a lawyer. We need the work anyway.

Clare Gilbert: It's really interesting in this case, because Joey *did* have a lawyer – a family lawyer, Bill O'Dell – right away.

Seema Iyer: Right.

Clare Gilbert: And Bill O'Dell gave the family the advice that I would give 100% of my clients when I was a public defender, which was, "No, do not talk to the police".

Seema Iyer: Never, ever, ever, ever.

- Clare Gilbert:** You just do not need to talk to them. But then, eventually he did accompany Joey on an interview with the police. And it's been interesting how, years after the fact, Joey and his parents are like, "If we had only just gone to the police at the time and told them right away that Joey wasn't involved..." They feel by not talking to the police right away, it gave the police the impression that Joey was hiding something, and made them focus on him more.
- Seema Iyer:** Well *did* the family lawyer go to the police right away *for* Joey? Like, did they call the cops and say, "Hey, Joey Watkins reached out to me, I'm the family attorney..." Did they make contact?
- Clare Gilbert:** I have not seen any sign of that anywhere.
- Seema Iyer:** Because, well, I'm sure you would agree the same thing. You know, you tell someone, "Don't talk to the police" but then *you* reach out to the detectives and say, "Okay, gimme some time, let me talk to my client..." and at least make contact, so that the police *know* that you are by all means cooperating with the investigation.
- Clare Miller:** Right. That obviously was happening at *some* point, because he set up the interview-
- Seema Iyer:** Right.
- Clare Gilbert:** But it's just been interesting to hear the family's side of it, when I'm so entrenched from the defense attorney's side that you shouldn't talk.
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah. That is interesting.
- Dennis Robinson:** Susan, you brought this up in the podcast. I mean Joey was kind of damned if he did, damned if he didn't. No matter what he told them about where he was coming from, where he was going to, it seemed like they were going to try to find a way to implicate him for this.
- Susan Simpson:** Yeah. There were some heartbreaking notes in the defense file, from the trial. And the notes are actually from Joey, and at the time I didn't know the context, and he writes something on the page – he's like, "*But he told me not to say that*". And I thought he was talking about his defense attorney saying, "Don't do this in the interview." I think he's actually referring to Mike Key, and Mike Key telling him, "Don't be precise on dates." And then the State goes back and uses that at trial, saying, "Look, he can't even tell you what times he was doing stuff."
- Seema Iyer:** Yeah, but wasn't his lawyer in the room then?
- Susan Simpson:** Yes.
- Seema Iyer:** So did the lawyer object to any of this, do you know? Were there any notes about the lawyer...?
- Susan Simpson:** I really do think Mike Key was actually trying to put the investigation back on track, in *his* mind, by redirecting attention from what he thought was not a viable suspect. And I don't think his advice was wrong, necessarily. It's just, it is, 'you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't'. If you give them precise times, you wouldn't be better off.

Seema Iyer: Right.

[45:24]

Dennis Robinson: Next up we've got an interesting theory from Instagram fan "Commory_Lynn Francis", here we go:

Could someone might have wanted to hurt Joey instead of Isaac? I'm only asking because they were both driving similar looking white trucks at the time. I know Isaac's was a Toyota model, but you all hadn't released the info on the model of Joey's truck. I also still think it's interesting that Benson called the incident a 'boyfriend-girlfriend dispute'.

So, I guess, two questions there, or at least a question and observation. Could somebody have been trying to hurt Joey instead of Isaac? And how did Benson come around to calling it a 'boyfriend-girlfriend dispute'?

Clare Gilbert: So, my sense is, *no*. You wouldn't confuse Joey for Isaac. Because the trucks were very different.

And the Benson part of it: I think it was just the kind of aggressive driving. The sort of jerkiness and pulling off the side, and waiting for Isaac's truck to pass before the blue car pulled back on. So there was some kind of relationship between them. It wasn't just some sort of random road rage going on. That was my sense of why Benson interpreted it as a boyfriend-girlfriend dispute.

Susan Simpson: While at the same time, that kind of sounds exactly like random road rage to me.

Clare Gilbert: Yeah, it does.

Colin Miller: I'm not here to distinguish that, yeah. If someone pisses you off on the road, you can see sort of the 'cat and mouse'-type thing. Or it could be pre-existing. I wouldn't draw any conclusions either way myself, at least.

Clare Gilbert: Yeah. No, I think my sense was that that's just the first thing that popped into his mind.

Dennis Robinson: Okay, interesting. Next let's give some love to our Twitter fans – we've got '@J S Liptchy' – I don't know if that's code for something, or if that's their initial's but here we go: "If the shot came through the rear window, would there be a bullet hole in the headset? Was there?" I'm sorry, "head rest".

Susan Simpson: This goes back to what me and Clare have been talking about lately. *Which* window? It's connected to Episode 4, really, because, you know, Marshall Smith testifies that it was the driver's side sliding window pane that was shot through. But I don't know how he concluded that.

Clare Gilbert: Yeah, I went down to the courthouse a couple weeks ago and looked at it again and put the window back together, and flipped it upside down, and back to front, and it definitely looks like it was-- Of the four different sections of the window, it was the internal *passenger* side, rather than the internal driver's side section of the window that was shot through.

[49:22]

≈

- Clare Gilbert:** Hey Dennis, while we're chatting, I thought that your question about Moser and Elrod, and how this was brought up in the podcast, was really interesting. And the defense not having the note. And because they didn't have the actual police note, they were not able to be as effective in their cross-examination as they could have been, had they been able to show the note. And then this masterfully tweaking Moser's response afterward.
- Dennis Robinson:** So you're talking about the, 'Joey didn't do it' letter?
- Susan Simpson:** No! The notes from the Adam Elrod interview that Moser did.
- Dennis Robinson:** Oh! The gun buy! The bearded man at the gas station, yeah. Tell me about that.
- Susan Simpson:** Yeah. Seema, when you were a prosecutor, did *you* hand over the police notes to the defense?
- Seema Iyer:** Abso-friggin'-lutely! Are you *kidding* me? And even now, you can't start a trial until you have *every single note*.
- And if they give you a note *after* the police witness testifies – that belongs to that police witness – then you have the right to recall that witness.
- So here's my question with this note: – Adam didn't remember on the stand, and then Colin explained really well in the last episode about not being able to cross him, because they didn't have the notes. And they also didn't have anything to refresh his recollection, even. But my question is, with Moser: Did you all think that the defense did enough to bring out that Adam was interviewed and Adam failed to mention the 'scraggly beard guy'?
- Was enough done? Was there any kind of motion to strike that part of the testimony?
- Clare Gilbert:** There *was* no motion to strike that part of the testimony. And the questions are there, and the answers are there, but the kind of *drama* that drills it into the jury to make them realize this is a moment of impeachment, this is significant... This blows Adam Elrod's testimony out of the water--
- Seema Iyer:** *Eeee...*
- Clare Gilbert:** Is not there.
- Seema Iyer:** What about closing argument? Was it brought up in closing argument?
- Susan Simpson:** It *was*, very casually, like, "You heard Adam Elrod, he couldn't even remember talking to Detective Moser".
- Clare Gilbert:** But that's not the key thing! The key thing--
- Colin Miller:** Mm-hmm.

Clare Gilbert:

Is that – and it’s just kind of buried in here – the question is:

“Did you then ask – in your discussion or interrogation – ask Mr Elrod about if he knew where Joey Watkins had obtained a pistol?”

Answer: “Yes.”

Question: “And what was Mr Elrod’s response?”

Answer: “He didn’t have any idea.”

And then he says: *“He didn’t have any idea where Joey got the pistol from.”*
And *“When did this discussion take place?”*

Answer: “It was on January 14th.”

And then he does say, actually: *“This is January 14th – three days after the incident and two days after Isaac Dawkins’ death, is that correct?”*

Answer: “Yes, ma’am.”

He leaves it there. But then the prosecutor comes back and I thought she just did a really good job of kind of undercutting everything that just happened by saying, “Well, isn’t it true that Adam said he was friends with Joey?”

And Detective Moser said, “Yes, to the best I can recall.” Which was not accurate. If the defense had the note--

Susan Simpson:

Right.

Clare Gilbert:

The note clearly says here, that “The suspect is too cocky. The suspect has no friends.”

Susan Simpson:

[laughs] I love that. Like, *come on*, Adam. Like, make the story more plausible. Tone it down a little bit.

Clare Gilbert:

And *then* the prosecutor goes on, to be like, “Well isn’t it just that you have a hard time with drawing information out from people, and at the beginning of this nobody wanted to give any information about Joey, and that’s why Adam wasn’t telling you the details of how this occurred?”

And, you know, she spreads this out over many questions, and I just thought that if the defense had had the note, itself--

Colin Miller:

Mm-hmm.

Clare Gilbert:

They would have been able to come back and just put that in front of Detective Moser’s face, and undo everything the prosecutor just did. But without this note, they really didn’t have any way to respond to that.

Seema Iyer:

But did they do anything to show that Adam could possibly be biased? Or have any motive to lie? And there’s no corroboration, right? This is a small town. They could have investigated to see, “Hey, is there a scraggly guy with a beard who sells guns?”

- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah, you'd think that would stand out.
- Susan Simpson:** Also, what truck has a window so tinted you can't see out?
[laughter]
- Dennis Robinson:** I'm just thinking that's the *one* thing in a small town that stands out. The local scraggly-bearded guy at the gas station who sells guns. You figure everybody would know about him.
- Seema Iyer:** If you can find someone like that in a big city like Baltimore or New York, which you *can*, I believe they could have looked and tried to find that person.
- Susan Simpson:** This is Cedartown! It's Cedartown – it's smaller than Rome. Like, there can't be *two* scraggly bearded guys selling guns to kids behind gas stations.
[laughter]
- Seema Iyer:** Did the defense know that Adam was going to say this?
- Clare Gilbert:** Yes.
- Susan Simpson:** Sort of... They didn't have the notes, but they had a summary from the police.
- Seema Iyer:** Right. So they could have done the investigation.
- Clare Gilbert:** Right. And from what we can tell, the only documentation of investigation into this that we can find, was Stanley Sutton, apparently, went looking for this person, and, surprise, surprise, couldn't find him.
- Dennis Robinson:** Of course he did.
- Clare Gilbert:** [laughs] Yeah.
- Dennis Robinson:** Okay folks, I want closing shots from our distinguished panel – I'll pass it off to each of you. Seema, I'd like to start with you.

I know that you're going to be part of an important event on August 19th, but there's no way in heck I'm trying to pronounce this location so I want to make sure that you try to tell us about that.
- Seema Iyer:** Thank you so much. So yes, on World Humanitarian Day, which is August 19th, in front of the United Nations at Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza--
- Dennis Robinson:** Nailed it.

- Seema Iyer:** I am part of an event, which is basically a peaceful protest to bring awareness to some impending executions of juveniles in Saudi Arabia.
- One of the young men who's most prominent is Ali Mohammed al-Nimmer, and he's just about 21 years old, today, so myself as along with Code Pink New York City, and a lot of member of, you know, humanitarian rights groups are all going to be there on August 19th, and I hope some of your New York listeners will join us.
- Dennis Robinson:** That would be very cool. And Seema, if folks want to find out more about you and possibly talk to you through the social medias, how can folks get a hold of you?
- Seema Iyer:** I'm on Twitter and Periscope, @SeemalyerEsq.
- Dennis Robinson:** Thanks Seema.
- Seema Iyer:** Thank you Dennis.
- Dennis Robinson:** Okay, distinguished *Undisclosed* hosts. I give the floor to you. Any closing shout outs?
- Clare Gilbert:** Donate to Georgia Innocence Project!
- Dennis Robinson:** Of course, obviously. And we were just talking about that. I hope you guys are getting some love from our *Undisclosed* listeners. *Undisclosed* listeners – I know that we hit you up all the time and ask you to support our sponsors, and the sponsors are great, but at the same time, you know, the folks at Georgia Innocence are doing so much important work on a shoestring budget – send some love their way too. And I know that you can find out how to do that at the website, www.georgiainnocenceproject.org. Send them some love so that they can continue to do the great work that they do, and give us more fodder for podcasts.
- Susan Simpson:** And I will say, I've never seen a group trying to do more with less, than the Georgia Innocence Project.
- Dennis Robinson:** Yeah, you guys are *thin*. I wish we could devote a whole *Addendum* to just how hard you bust your asses down there. And really how hard the Innocence Projects in general, across the country, work to get buy. So Clare, thank you for your hard work.
- Clare Gilbert:** And we have lots of other great cases that donations would really help us investigate and move forward. So anything you could give, we're very grateful for.
- Dennis Robinson:** Very cool. And that wraps it up, folks. Thanks!

≈