

UNDISCLOSED, the State v. Chester Hollman III
Episode 3 - Testilying
February 19, 2018

[0:22] Colin Miller: A palinode is a poem in which the poet retracts a view or sentiment expressed in a former poem. The legend is that the first palinode was written by Stesichorus, who was deprived of his sight after writing that Helen was the cause of the Trojan War. Later, he wrote a palinode, which roughly translates to:

There is no truth in that story,
You didn't ride in the well-rowed galleys,
You didn't reach the walls of Troy.

By righting this wrong, Stesichorus regained his vision.

The concept that a palinode can make someone whole again, whether figuratively or literally, has always held a tenuous position in legal systems. Under Scottish law, a party accused of defamation could traditionally offer a public palinode either voluntarily or at the prompting of a court. Some viewed the palinode as a positive, noting the “[v]alue of this expedient in reconciling animosities, shortening lawsuits, and saving litigants from expenses which may often proven ruinous to both parties.” Others opposed them, arguing that they were lacking in credibility and sincerity and were instead an empty public show of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

In the American criminal justice system, we have our own version of the palinode: the witness recantation. Defendants often offer them with the hope that their convictions will be reversed. But, in practice, such palinodes rarely have intended effect of making either the accuser or the accused whole again.

[2:08] Rabia Chaudry: Chester Hollman III was charged with the murder of Tae Jung Ho on Aug 21, 1991, one day after he had been killed. He wasn't just charged with murder though, he was charged with first-degree murder, simple assault, aggravated assault, conspiracy, robbery, theft, carrying an unlicensed firearm on public streets, and receiving stolen property. You could say that they threw the book at him.

The next month, in September 1991, three witnesses testified at a preliminary hearing: Junko Neihei, Deirdre Jones, and Andre Dawkins. A preliminary hearing is held before a

magistrate judge to determine whether there is probable cause so that the case can go to trial.

Junko testified to the events of the night that her boyfriend was killed. Her recollection was fairly consistent with her police statement from the night of the murder, except she seemed to recall more about the man who was *not* the shooter, the man who held down Tae Jung Ho's legs, was wearing - she had stated on the night of the murder she didn't remember anything about what the shooter himself wore, and she stuck by that in her testimony, but at this hearing she mentioned the second man, again, the one holding down her boyfriend's legs, wore a white t-shirt of some kind and maybe white sneakers or high tops, along with the dark cap and shorts she had mentioned in her initial statement.

Junko was asked if she could remember what either of the men looked like, and she said no. She was asked if there was anyone in the courtroom that she could recognize as one of the men who attacked Tae Jung. And although Chester Hollman sat by his attorney, right there in the courtroom in front of her, she said no. She didn't recognize anyone in the courtroom on that day.

But it didn't matter because Andre Dawkins was there too, and he was there to testify. Dawkins, who had been cleaning the gas station parking lot that night, had made some initial identifications on the night of the murder. He told the police, after they took Deirdre and Chester to the police station, that he recognized Chester as the man who held down Tae Jung's legs. He also identified Deirdre as the girl in the passenger seat of the Blazer when it was parked at the gas pumps, and finally he picked Deirdre's sister, Tiffany Jones, out of a photo array the day after his initial statement. At the preliminary hearing, he once again positively identified Chester as one of the two attackers.

And then of course, there's Deirdre, who testified that she was with Chester and two other people that night in a white Blazer, driving around Center City, Philadelphia, when they saw, attacked, and killed Tae Jung Ho. Not only that, she also identified Andre Dawkins, who was sitting in the courtroom right then as she testified, as the man she had seen while parked at the gas station when the two men with her were actually committing the crime.

Of course, this was all more than enough to establish probable cause that a crime had been committed by the defendant and so it was going to proceed to trial. No one else was ever charged, and for all intents and purposes, it doesn't even look like the police

ever tried to find the actual gunman. Deirdre walked away scott free, without even a plea deal, because of course to get a plea deal you actually have to be charged with something.

So Chester was the only one to be held responsible for Tae Jung's murder, but his trial wouldn't happen for two more years. Long before that, in October of 1991, Chester pled not guilty to every charge against him.

[5:37] Rabia Chaudry: Hi and welcome to Undisclosed, the State v/ Chester Hollman III. This episode is 'Testilying'. My name is Rabia Chaudry, I'm an attorney and author, and I'm here with my colleagues, Susan Simpson and Colin Miller.

Susan Simpson: Hi, I'm Susan Simpson. I blog at TheViewFromLL2, and I also podcast with Rabia at The 45th.

Colin Miller: Hi, this is Colin Miller. I'm an Associate Dean and Professor at The University of South Carolina School of Law, and I blog at EvidenceProfBlog.

[6:59] Susan Simpson: Rabia was the first one to find out about Chester Hollman's case, and she sent us an article after she read it. It was called "Testilying", and it ran in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* in April of 2017. It was written by journalists Emilie Lounsberry and Michaelle Bond, and it is an in-depth piece that is also a gut-puncher. It detailed the murder of Tae Jung Ho in 1991, and the later conviction of Chester Hollman, and many years later, the recantation of witness statements by the very same people who had sealed Chester's fate. It also tackled broader problems of how courts handle witness lying. But the focal point of the piece is a woman who wanted to clear her conscience. That woman was Deirdre Jones.

In January 2012, the then 40 year-old Deirdre Jones took the witness stand for the third time in her life. The first two times had been to help convict Chester Hollman. This time, it was to help exonerate him. Her story was remarkable, and it all began in the early hours of August 20, 1991, when the police had Deirdre in their custody and elicited her confession.

That confession became the basis for her testimony at Chester's preliminary hearing in 1991, and at his subsequent trial in 1993. The State presented a long series of witnesses, including half a dozen police officers, but most of them weren't able to

present any direct evidence against Chester. For example, Salvatore Genestra, the man who was sitting with his girlfriend on the church steps that night, testified about seeing a hooded man run from the scene and get into the waiting Blazer, but at no point did he tie Chester to the crime. Officer James Lloyd, who was one of the cops that pulled Chester over and patted him down, testified that Chester's heart was pounding and he was sweating, you know, as someone would do if he were guilty. Or as if they'd do if two cops had loaded guns trained on them on a hot summer night. So, no, not evidence of guilt.

And there was no forensic evidence tying Chester to the murder. They never found the weapon used to kill Tae Jung. The police did eventually seize the service gun from Chester's apartment, the one he'd been issued, and they tested it, and discovered that it had never been discharged, like ever. And no blood was found on Chester. That red stain on his shirt sleeve? Who knows, but could be fruit punch gatorade, like he bought at the gas station that night. And there was no change of clothing in the car. None of Chester's prints or hair or anything was found on Tae Jung's body, and nothing belonging to Tae Jung was found on Chester or in his car or on Deirdre. They couldn't even make the case that the \$37 they found on Chester was the victim's money because there was nothing to connect that money to what was taken from the victim. As far as they knew, there had been no money taken at all.

So the only arguable evidence that tied Chester Hollman directly to the crime was the eyewitness evidence from two people: Andre Dawkins and Deirdre Jones.

[9:57] Colin Miller: Now, we could go into all the trial testimony and the many discrepancies it contains in order to break down the State's case. It would be a fun exercise just because there are so many - like Officer Lloyd's testimony about where Chester was coming from when he was pulled over not matching up to the direction we know the perpetrators were last seen going. And Dawkins testimony, which was so confused that even the prosecutor acknowledged in closing that he may have some credibility issues.

You can also see, in this testimony, how hard the police are trying to make it all fit together. One little example is that when Chester was arrested, he was wearing long aqua colored sweatpants, but Junko had said the man holding Tae Jung's legs was wearing shorts. To account for this, on the stand Detective Piree, the one who Chester says punched him in the mouth, said he was wearing sweatpants that he had pulled up to his knees. Ergo, problem solved. The State had a lot of problems to solve, many of which the defense didn't quite catch or nail, but at this point in time there really is no

point and no need to unravel every discrepancy because when it comes down to it, the foundation of the prosecution's case has been destroyed.

Deirdre recanted in 2012 but a decade before that, someone else recanted too: Andre Dawkins.

On March 27, 2001, Dawkins gave the following written affidavit:

[11:09] Rabia Chaudry, reading affidavit:

My name is Andre Dawkins. My date of birth is 7/31/60.

I was a witness in a homicide case involving the murder of Tae Jun Ho. This occurred on 8/20/91 at 22nd and Samson St.

I testified falsely in that case at the prompting of the district attorney and the police detectives. I never saw what I said I saw. The police gave me the description of the suspects, so I could identify them.

I was interrogated while handcuffed and held in a cell. I was threatened with jail time. The police and the D.A. knew of my police record and had my rap sheet on the table at the time of the interview. I was told I was a career criminal and if I did not cooperate I would get jail time for an open case (Burglary). If I would cooperate I would get probation. I signed statements under intimidation and duress. I got six months probation for the burglary.

At that time of my life I was involved in criminal activity and needed favors from the police and the D.A. I was afraid.

I am now clean and sober and I want to recant my statements and testimony.

[12:15] Colin Miller: Two months later, in May of 2001, Dawkins sat down with Chester's appellate attorney Clinton Johnson and a defense investigator Crosson for a deposition.

[12:25] Clinton Johnson:

At what point did you give a false statement in this case?

Andre Dawkins:

From the very beginning.

Clinton Johnson:

And why have you chosen to give the statements that you are about to give?

Andre Dawkins:

Well first I've already given them once. So the first time I had given them it was because I wanted to help a person get out of jail. And I still feel the same way. At that present time I was on drugs, and I was a car thief. I broke into cars, at that time. And the cops knew me, so when it happened, automatically they came to me. It was like...well I've got warrants, I've got cases, open cases, and like I wanted to get in good with the cops. And, I mean, if I wanted to tell the truth I couldn't. That's how scared I was.

The person that's locked up now, they wanted me to say I saw him.

Clinton Johnson:

And the person that's locked up now is Chester Hollman.

Andre Dawkins:

Yes

Clinton Johnson:

OK, Chester Hollman III. And, did you see Chester Hollman III on the night you heard the gunshot in the area of 22nd and Sansom St. in Philadelphia?

Andre Dawkins:

No I didn't.

Clinton Johnson:

OK, and did you testify falsely with regard to any other aspects of the case?

Andre Dawkins:

I testified falsely through the whole case. Nothing I said was the truth because I did what they wanted me to do. Because it was a chance for me not to go to jail or to take some time off my sentence as what I was gonna get.

[14:13] Rabia Chaudry: By the time Dawkins had recanted, between the years of 1995 and 2000, Chester had already filed a direct appeal to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania, an allowance of appeal to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, a writ of habeas corpus in federal court, a writ of cert with the US Supreme Court, a PCRA post conviction relief petition, as well as half dozen motions. He lost all of them. And he filed appeals when he lost them, and he lost the appeals to them as well.

After Dawkins came forward, Chester got one more shot, and on May 21, 2001 he filed his second PCRA petition based on newly discovered evidence: the videotaped deposition by Dawkins recanting his trial testimony and the PCRA also asserted that the prosecuting attorney and investigating police detectives coerced and intimidated him, suborned his perjury and knowingly withheld *Brady* information concerning these facts, as well as withholding Dawkins' extensive criminal record from the defense. And Dawkins did have a criminal record, which he lied about at trial, and he also had been treated for mental illness, including schizophrenia, which he actually affirmed at trial.

Now, this second PCRA was filed with the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, but here Chester hit a procedural roadblock - the appeal of his first PCRA was still pending in the Superior Court, and because of that, the second PCRA was denied for lack of jurisdiction.

So Chester filed a motion to reconsider.

Denied.

Then he filed an appeal.

Denied.

Then he filed a motion to reconsider that appeal.

Denied.

Which takes us to 2004, when he filed yet one more PCRA with the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, which was actually accepted this time. But, in a matter of months, the court dismissed it without a hearing. Chester filed something called a petition for allocatur - asking that he be allowed to appeal the dismissal to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

And again, it was denied.

Now, his next shot was in 2006, when Chester filed one more PCRA with the Court of Common Pleas based on *Brady* and new evidence, and specifically requested a hearing. He had some major new evidence. In fact, it was explosive new evidence.

[16:32] Dennis Crosson:

OK, today is Tuesday, August 16, 2005. It is 5:20 pm. My name is Dennis J. Crosson. I am a licensed private investigator from DJC Investigations. We are about to conduct an investigatory interview with Ms. Deirdre Jones.

Deirdre Jones:

My name is Deirdre C. Jones. My date of birth is March, 8, 1971. I am giving this statement to Dennis J. Crosson, a private investigator from DJC Investigations, of my own free will and under no threats. I was forced under threats of my personal safety to testify in the murder trial. The defendant in the trial was Chester Hollman III. The trial took place in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas in 1993 in regard to the murder that took place in 1991 in Philadelphia. My testimony was forced, inaccurate, and given under duress. I will...I would like to set the record straight but I am still concerned with my safety and feel threatened if I tell the truth.

[18:55] Alan Tauber:

Those statements were used -- uh the recantations, are under Pennsylvania law, considered new evidence. That would be new evidence of innocence, and they do provide essentially a basis for appeal. That appeal goes back, in those cases, that appeal goes back to the trial court. The trial judge, um, has to convene a hearing do determine the credibility of that evidence. So, essentially Deirdre testifies and...Deirdre testifies to the judge, and now the trial judge in our case, uh had passed away and it was reassigned to another judge who knew nothing about the, you know, didn't sit, didn't preside on the case, and had to be....you know, had to be educated on the background of the case. So, a hearing after a long period of appeals -- we file this, um, and Pennsylvania law is pretty clear that if you have recantation of a material witness, you're entitled to a hearing. Uh, and the court has to -- the judge has to determine if that new evidence, the recantation, is credible. If the judge determines it's credible, the witness is now

telling the truth, the court then has to decide if that, had that evidence been presented at trial, could it have had a material effect on the verdict?

[20:10] Susan Simpson: That's Chester's attorney Alan Tauber, who you heard from in episode one of this series, and he's talking about how the new evidence, these recantations, were used to file a new PCRA. And, along with the recantation itself, Chester's team had Deirdre take a polygraph test, which she passed.

Unfortunately, at the trial level, the court refused to give Chester a hearing, which he was entitled to given that he clearly had new evidence to present to the court. So the PCRA was dismissed but this time, on appeal, Chester had some luck. The Superior Court reversed the trial court's decision, and ordered Chester Hollman be granted a hearing on the new evidence, and remanded the case back down to the trial court.

That hearing took place in 2012. Which, just a reminder, this is a hearing for a PCRA that was filed in 2006 -- so, six years prior. That's right, it took six years, from filing, for that hearing to take place.

Only two witnesses testified: one for each side. Deirdre went first. She was then a 40 year old phlebotomist, and she stated that, for the record, that since the night of her and Chester's arrest, back in 1991, she had not been in contact with Chester Hollman. She hadn't seen him, spoken to him, written to him, or been in touch with his family. She stated that even before her recantation in 2005, she'd been visited numerous times by defense investigators attempting to get her to come clean, but she wouldn't.

And she wouldn't because she'd been scared. The detectives had not only threatened her with charges for murder, but had told her that Chester had a criminal record and mob ties. And, because she was testifying against him, they said, the mob could hurt her. She had little reason to know that they were lying, because while she lived in the same building as Chester, she didn't really know him that well -- they were acquaintances, more than anything. And she took the threat so seriously that, at the urging of police, the day after she was released from custody, she took her two young kids and fled to Georgia, to live there with her grandmother. The State paid for her to travel back to testify, but she didn't otherwise leave the state of Georgia for many years.

So, at the PCRA hearing, step by step they went through her testimony, and she refuted every allegation from that night.

Did Chester ever get out of the car?

No.

Did anyone else get in the car?

No.

Did he ever discuss a robbery?

No.

Did you see him commit a robbery?

No.

Did he have a gun with him?

No.

Did Chester ever tell you not to talk to the police?

No.

And on and on, until she'd refuted everything she said that night.

Instead, Deirdre described being pulled over and being told to get out of the car, but being so nervous and terrified that she couldn't get the door open. The cop on her side of the car was not only pointing a gun at her, he kept saying, "I'm going to shoot you, I'm going to shoot you."

Finally she got out of the car and she was cuffed and taken to the crime scene, and then taken to the police station, where for hours two detectives took turns coming into the room and throwing questions and scenarios at her. They told her, for instance, that there were witnesses who saw her there, who identified her from the crime, and that Chester himself had confessed to it.

She testified that she was told that if she testified against Chester, she wouldn't be charged with anything, which she wasn't. And when she was asked if the statement she signed on the night of the murder was true, she responded, "absolutely not."

And when asked why she chose to come forward now, she replied, "I'm not afraid anymore. I'm not afraid."

[24:10] Rabia Chaudry: But her cross examination was brutal. The prosecutor went through her police statement paragraph by paragraph asking whether she had said those words or the police had told her to, tripping her up, making her sound unsure at times, even as she kept insisting none of the statement was her words. Did the police make up the dialogue in her statement, the description of the other people in the car, how she was feeling even? Deirdre insisted yes, they did, but for the casual observer it does beggar belief that detectives would go so far, and be so descriptive, in fabricating a witness statement from whole cloth.

But it doesn't mean that they didn't do it.

After Deirdre testified, Chester's attorney asked to present a corroborating witness, Andre Dawkins. The problem was Dawkins was in prison, and they couldn't present him at the hearing. So, they needed a continuance in order to secure his presence, but the judge wasn't having it. The continuance was denied.

The State then presented their only witness, detective David Baker. Baker was the detective who had interrogated Deirdre and taken her statement from her the night of the murder. And at this hearing, he denied every allegation Deirdre was now making. He testified that he made no threats to charge her with murder (in fact he actually stated in his 35 year career he had never done so with anyone), he said that he made no promises not to charge her for cooperating, that she never requested an attorney, that he never told her Chester was in the mob, that she didn't seem scared at all, and the answers in her statement were not just her words, but that they were her words verbatim.

The hearing didn't last long, and after taking a lunch break, Philadelphia Common Pleas Judge Gwendolyn Bright was ready to rule. She rejected the new evidence stating: "I have considered the testimony of Ms. Jones and, on balance, I do not find her recanted testimony to be credible. Therefore, I am denying the motion for a new trial."

It seems shocking, but it's not uncommon, when it comes to witness recantations, that many courts don't believe them.

[27:41] Colin Miller: An article in the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* notes that:

"The origin of the presumption that recantations are inherently unreliable is not well documented. Early cases indicate that the current presumption of untrustworthiness may have derived from the belief that the verdict of the jury warrants a presumption that the witness's trial testimony was true and that recanted testimony is therefore false."

Despite this article's contention, I was able to trace the history of this belief in 17 states, including Pennsylvania. It derives from the 1916 opinion of the Court of Appeals of New York in People v. Shilitano. Oresto Shilitano, also known as the Paper Box Kid, was convicted of murdering a 22 year-old victim in front of a tenement house in lower Manhattan. Subsequently, the three main witnesses for the prosecution recanted their trial testimony, including Nellie De Carlo, who had testified at trial that she saw Shilitano's father hand him a revolver soon before the murder. In her post-trial affidavit, De Carlo stated that she did not see the shooting and was asleep in bed at the time. In addition to this she says the two detectives frightened her into giving the testimony which they desired. According to her story they slapped her and took her to a room in the grocery store and slapped her again. She asserts that at police headquarters "I began crying and they told me to sit in a chair. The chair suddenly shot up and I fell out. I fell unconscious on the floor. When I came to I was sore and bruised all over my body, as if I had been kicked."

The justices write this story off as "an extraordinary production" and note the following:

"Bearing in mind that the witnesses to crimes of violence are often of a low and degraded character and that after they have given their testimony they are sometimes influenced by bribery and other improper considerations, it is evident that the establishment of a rule which left the power to grant a new trial to a defendant to depend upon recantation by such witnesses would be subversive of the proper administration of justice."

In turn, this allowed them to conclude that "There is no form of proof so unreliable as recanting testimony."

[29:39] Colin Miller: Pennsylvania, which seemingly had no fixed antipathy to witness recantations, adopted this reasoning 6 years later, in Commonwealth v. Miller, in which three children recanted their testimony that their father had murder their mother. According to each, they testified against their father only because they were told “that unless their father was convicted of murder of the first degree and executed, he would get out of prison and kill them, and that if the defendant was convicted and executed, his children would get their shares of his estate, estimated at from \$15,000 to \$20,000.”

But, according to the court, these recantations were not only unreliable, but the most unreliable form of proof that can be presented in court. And so now, about a century after the Shilitano case, states from Arizona to Michigan to Pennsylvania continue to view witness recantations not with mere skepticism but with outright hostility due to an opinion rendered in a world with a completely different belief system about so many aspects of the criminal justice system.

[30:32] Susan Simpson: And that’s a shame because we know that witnesses do lie at trial, and it happens so often, that according to the same *Inquirer* article that we mentioned earlier, that since 1989 more than one thousand people convicted on the basis of false testimony by witnesses have been exonerated. Defendants themselves will lie and give false confessions - and studies show that in a quarter of all DNA exonerations, they’re cases where the defendant confessed to the crime.

So, why do they lie, or falsely confess, or falsely implicate others? It’s not that complicated - threats, physical punishment, torture, incentives, self-preservation, coercion, there are an entire host of reasons that people involved in wrongful convictions end up giving false statements, and testifying falsely at trial. And those reasons very often lead back to the police who are trying to get the statements from the witnesses that they needed in order to make the case.

And here, for Chester Hollman, In his case, the detective in question is not unknown in the Philadelphia wrongful conviction world. Detective David Baker is one of eleven officers named in an ongoing civil suit filed by Anthony Wright, who was exonerated in 2016. The charge? pressuring suspects to confess and intimidating witnesses to implicate suspects. And, as you might recall from our update episode, on Willie Veasy’s case, in the case of Anthony Wright, what Detective Baker did was coerce 3 teenagers into giving statements that told them that Anthony Wright was guilty. So, finding teenagers and getting statements out of them was not unknown to these detectives.

[32:15] Rabia Chaudry: I have lost track of the number of appeals, motions, and petitions Chester has filed in the last 24 years since his conviction. Make no mistake, no incarcerated person could do all that on his own. It takes a support system, family or friends, who don't leave your side, who keep paying the legal bills, who keep fighting. And Chester's family was relentless. They never doubted his innocence.

[32:38] Deonna Hollman:

So, when all this took place, it was just like, what are they talking about? They have to have the wrong person. Well, even before looking at the case, I said, they've got the wrong person. It's without a doubt, they've got the wrong person.

[32:50] Rabia Chaudry: That is Deonna, Chester's sister, his only sibling. Like many of us who have seen the wrongful conviction of a loved one up close, she never thought he would end up spending much of his life in prison.

[33:02] Deonna Hollman:

Well, like, when all of this unfolded, um, I thought for certain, when we were sitting in that courtroom... He's coming home. But, that wasn't the case. And I know my dad can tell you, um, my mom, and we were all sitting there, like ready, ok, like this is it, this is-- he's coming home, they've got the wrong person, they see that, nothing's matching up, things aren't linking together... that wasn't the case.

[33:23] Rabia Chaudry: Chester didn't come home, but he's fought like hell to, and his team spent years tracking down the witnesses who he hoped and prayed would finally tell the truth. But, I know too well the pain of having waited years and years to present the witness that you think will change the course of a case, only to have it all fall apart because a state official lied on the stand. It happened to Chester in 2012, and, by the way, it also happened to Adnan in 2012 at his first PCRA hearing. It's devastating because you feel like, well, this was supposed to be it, how much more can be done?

[33:57] Deonna Hollman:

And then, even when we had that recantation, um, that testimony from two witnesses who both passed polygraph tests, still even, he sits in jail. We had that breakthrough as we were stating before, about the Philadelphia Inquirer, the front page, the article, you know, that was like, our breakthrough of intent for people to really look at the case, and even prior to that, the Pennsylvania Innocence Project has been working on this case, you know, all those things, but still, he's in jail.

[34:27] Rabia Chaudry: So where does a defendant go from there?

Chester hit a legal wall when he lost that last PCRA five years ago. He had presented, over the span of a decade, recantations of both witnesses who had testified against him at trial. But, maybe that begs the question of whether it was really the testimony of these witnesses that sealed his conviction to begin with.

In fact, there are handwritten juror notes found in Chester's file addressed to the trial judge that seem to suggest the jury actually wasn't completely sold on the testimony. One note reads:

[35:00] Susan Simpson, narrating:

If "reasonable doubt" regarding the direct evidence exists is that enough to disregard all circumstantial evidence? Does this follow the courts charge?"

[35:10] Rabia Chaudry: The jurors were having doubts about the direct evidence presented to them, the testimony of Jones and Dawkins, but aren't sure if that doubt outweighs the circumstantial evidence, which we actually haven't addressed yet.

And that circumstantial evidence is the reason Chester and Deirdre were pulled over to begin with - they were driving in a white Chevy Blazer with tags starting with the letters YZA. Now, at first glance that may seem like direct evidence - after all it matches the description of the getaway vehicle exactly. But that night, there was more than one white Chevy Blazer on the streets of Philadelphia. There was another one, that was being driven by a young woman with long dark hair and a bleach streak that ran through it.

Next time, on Undisclosed.

[36:15] Rabia Chaudry: A big thank you and shout out to Celeste Trusty, who is an assistant producer and lead investigation on this case with me, and also to Zachary Stern with the Pennsylvania Innocence Project, thank you for all the work you've done in helping us research this case. Thank you to Mital Telhan, our executive producer, to Baluki for our fabulous new logo and branded graphics. A big thanks to all of our sponsors who keep us on the air and of course a big thanks to the person who keeps us sounding good, our audio producer extraordinaire Rebecca LaVoie of Partners in Crime media, and host of the podcast Crime Writers On and HGTV and me. Make sure to follow us on Facebook and Twitter - our handle is @UndisclosedPod. And you can use

the tag #UDAddendum to tag us in questions for every week's addendum. Thanks so much for listening.

**Transcript compiled by @britabee, @slowdawning, @TheWindAndRain, and
@blueroBin35**