

UNDISCLOSED, the State v. Terrance Lewis
Episode 4 - Omar 60 & Walnut
January 22, 2018

[0:25] Colin Miller: In 1952, Bertrand Russell created a thought experiment known as Russell's Teapot, which relates to the burden of proof. It goes as follows:

If I were to suggest that between the Earth and Mars there is a china teapot revolving about the sun in an elliptical orbit, nobody would be able to disprove my assertion provided I were careful to add that the teapot is too small to be revealed even by our most powerful telescopes.

But if I were to go on to say that, since my assertion cannot be disproved, it is an intolerable presumption on the part of human reason to doubt it, I should rightly be thought to be talking nonsense.

If, however, the existence of such a teapot were affirmed in ancient books, taught as the sacred truth every Sunday, and instilled into the minds of children at school, hesitation to believe in its existence would become a mark of eccentricity and entitle the doubter to the attentions of the psychiatrist in an enlightened age or of the Inquisitor in an earlier time.

Now, obviously, Russell is speaking directly on the subject of religion, and it's clear where his sympathy lies. But a similar logic can be applied to cases of possible wrongful convictions. Imagine a world in which Terrance Lewis were a 38 year-old man, working a 9-5 job, and supporting his family, and yet I said you, "you should believe he was involved in a murder in 1996, based upon the word of a single eyewitness who admitted to smoking crack soon before the shooting." You would rightfully doubt me.

But in this world, I can come into court and say that six witnesses have come forward and said that Terrance Lewis was innocent and that his trial attorney has admitted that he was ineffective in failing to locate at least one of them. And yet, two decades ago, Terrance Lewis was convicted on the word of that same questionable eyewitness. So, where should the burden of proof lie?

[2:19] Rabia Chaudry: Hi and welcome to Undisclosed: The State v. Terrance Lewis. This is our final episode in this series. My name is Rabia Chaudry, I'm an attorney and author, and I blog at SplitTheMoon.com, and I'm here with my colleagues Susan Simpson and Colin Miller.

Susan Simpson: Hi, I'm Susan Simpson. I'm an attorney in Washington, D.C. And I blog at the ViewFromLL2.

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 EvidenceProf Blog.

[3:00] Rabia Chaudry: In a case like Terrance's, where there's barely any evidence of guilt, how are you supposed to prove innocence? There's almost nothing in it to refute, and very little left to prove.

What more can Terrance do? He'll never be able to produce an alibi -- it was already far too late to figure out any sort of alibi at the time he was arrested for the crime in 1997. There's no forensic evidence in the case, no surveillance cameras, no fingerprints.

It's a case destined to turn on eyewitness evidence and eyewitness evidence alone. That's the one area of the case where Terrance has gotten a bit of a break -- because there were witnesses to this crime, or at least the before and after of it. Lots of them, hanging out on the street that night, who saw the three men's faces as they entered or left Bernard Howard's rowhouse. And so far six witnesses have come forward to say he was not one of them. Two of those witnesses are his own co-defendants. None of the four "outside" witnesses -- people who were on the street that night and saw the men entering and leaving the rowhouse -- were close friends of Terrance, and some of them barely even knew him, hadn't heard from him in years, had not even known that he was in prison for the better part of two decades. None of them had any apparent motivation to lie on Terrance's behalf.

But how is that sort of evidence supposed to be weighed after trial?

[4:13] Susan Simpson: Because no matter how many additional witnesses come forward, the State can just shrug its shoulders and point to Star, to Lena Laws, and say that *she*, and she alone, is the case's credible witness. That she is the only person who has anything truthful or useful to say about the night in question. That all other witnesses are lying or mistaken, and only she is giving an accurate account of what happened that night.

And how is Terrance supposed to respond to that? There's no scientific formula that lets you determine which witnesses are lying and which are not. Not in a case like this. And when it comes to witnesses, it's not a question of quantity -- the fact that you have more witnesses than the other side doesn't mean you're right.

And that's true here. Just because the State has the one witness and Terrance has six, that doesn't prove by itself that the state witness is weaker.

So well, it probably comes as no surprise that throughout the years of Terrance's ongoing PCRA claims, the State has remained *unimpressed* with Terrance's claims of innocence.

[5:02] Colin Miller: In 2011, Terrance filed a petition for certiorari for review of his federal claims by the United States Supreme Court. In its opposition to the cert petition, the State dismissed out of hand any suggestion that this might be a case where the court system got it wrong. As the State wrote in its brief:

[narrated by Rabia Chaudry]:

Petitioner grandiosity proclaims his own innocence and then contends that this Court must grant review in order to construe 28 U.S.C., Section 2254(e)(2) so as to permit him an evidentiary hearing to pursue a claim of counsel ineffectiveness, despite the default of his claims in state court. In fact, the weak, suspect allegations he presents are nowhere near the kind of exculpatory evidence that the Court found compelling under the Schlup standard in House v. Bell.

As for Kizzi Baker, the witness who came forward to say she'd seen the men on the street that night, the State's brief takes on an almost sarcastic tone:

[narrated by Rabia Chaudry]:

According to these statements [from petitioner's witnesses], petitioner's sister met Kizzi Baker by chance in a bar one evening. Fortuitously, the sister and Kizzi started chatting, and it turned out [that], on the night of the murder, ten years earlier, Kizzi happened to be standing on a corner down the street from the victim's home. She heard a gunshot and saw three men leaving the scene. While she did not really know petitioner, and had not seen him around the neighborhood for several years, she was able to remember (a decade later) that petitioner was not one of the men she saw leaving. ... Ms. Baker's conveniently discovered testimony - that she does not believe a young man she recognized only in passing, and had not seen for years, was one of the men who fled the murder scene, at a distance, in the dark, ten years earlier - is not enough to constitute "actual innocence" without making a mockery of the concept.

And as for the finding of the federal magistrate judge that oversaw the evidentiary hearing and found Terrance actually innocent, the State's brief made no attempt to hide its disdain:

[narrated by Rabia Chaudry]:

In March 2010, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that habeas relief be denied. Remarkably, however, despite the shoddy evidence of "actual innocence" presented by petitioner, the magistrate judge (who of course had never heard the evidence of guilt presented at the trial) credulously concluded that petitioner had met the Schlup standard, thereby permitting review of his underlying claim that his conviction was invalid because of counsel ineffectiveness.

[7:25] Susan Simpson: And you can't tell from hearing the brief read aloud, but one kind of striking thing about the State's brief is just how heavily it relies on scare quotes. It's not just 'shoddy evidence of actual innocence,' it's, 'shoddy evidence of *Actual Innocence*.' Same goes for the reference to Terrance's quote-unquote "*Proof*" of innocence, or his "*New Witnesses*" that came forward.

And, as a contrast to Terrance's apparently derision-worthy claims, the State held up for comparison the testimony of Lena Laws, aka Star, as the only truly believable witness before the court:

[narrated by Rabia Chaudry]:

Against this weak, suspect evidence stands the direct, disinterested testimony of the main witness at trial - the victim's girlfriend, Lena Laws. Petitioner dismisses Ms. Laws' testimony because she was a drug addict. But the jury was well aware of Ms. Laws' addiction, and chose to believe her credible testimony that the victim was murdered before her eyes by men whom she had known for months, as they had been selling drugs from her home. [. . .]

The only fact of any consequence that Ms. Laws got wrong, according to petitioner, was her identification of him, by name, as the robber with the shotgun. It seems rather implausible that Ms. Laws's drug addiction would render her perfectly capable of recognizing all the other drug dealers and robbers in the house - men she had known for months leading up to the murder - but, conveniently, not petitioner.

[8:41] Colin Miller: But of course that has never been what Terrance has claimed. Nor is it what the prosecutor at Terrance's trial claimed either, for that matter, since that was self-evidently not the case. Star was wrong about a lot of things, some of them brought up at the trial, some of them not. But the State's position on appeal was that Star truly is the virtually perfect witness that the prosecutor claimed her to be at trial in his opening and closing statements.

[11:17] Colin Miller: At trial, the only evidence of Terrance's guilt that the jury ever heard was Star's testimony. But that doesn't necessarily mean that's all the evidence of guilt that exists. Just like how witnesses favorable to the defense never got in, there's also evidence that's favorable to the State that never made it into court. And it's not unreasonable for the State to rely on that evidence in addition to Star's testimony in assessing Terrance's case. So, what other evidence might the State have?

The most significant evidence is Terrance's nickname: Stink. The jury never heard it, so it played no role in their decision, but the name Terrance went by was in fact Stink, which is one of the three names Star gave Detective Hughes on the night of the murder. To the State, this is a clear, bright line, connecting Terrance to the murder. It's the proof that verifies Star's claims. After all, that can't be a coincidence, can it? Star said a guy named Stink did it, and the police found a guy named Stink that sort of matches the physical description Star gave, and Star chose his photo out of a lineup of tiny, grainy student IDs.

[12:16] Susan Simpson: And that's a plausible interpretation of the evidence, sure, but it's also not the only plausible interpretation. Star knew who Stink was. Not well, but she knew of him, and knew who his uncle was. She smoked crack with Terrance's uncle at times, at his house, the same house where Terrance's grandmother lived and where Terrance often visited her. Star had seen him there.

So, if Star was truly trying to help the police identify Stink, well why'd she never tell him where he could be found? She knew his uncle and grandmother, and their address -- and that would have allowed the police to identify Terrance in no more than a day or two -- if she'd given that info to them anyway. But she didn't. So why not?

You can speculate on a thousand reasons this could have been, but none of them do that much to support Star's credibility. Either Star was deceiving the police for some unknown reason and failing to give them info they needed to identify Stink, or...maybe she was confused and couldn't remember that she knew Stink's family, or she was confused and couldn't remember who the guy that she saw in the house really was and

couldn't remember that she knew his family, or she was confused and remembered the wrong nickname of the guy who had the shotgun, or a dozen other possible reasons. But, what it doesn't support, is the idea that Star gave police an unambiguous and clear description of Terrance Lewis as the shotgun wielder in the house that night.

And it's also not hard to see how Star might have made a mistake here. She knew a guy named Stink, and she knew he was someone that JR, her drug dealer, knew. What if that night in the house, she saw JR and saw another guy with him that was vaguely taller or lighter skinned than JR, and the name Stink came to her mind because that was someone who also knew JR who was taller and lighter skinned than he was? That sort of mistake is common enough in all kinds of situations -- in classrooms or parties or at the office -- people do that all the time. Or anytime you might run into a casual acquaintance. And that's without the additional stress of having guns drawn on you and without the added confusion of having smoked crack just a few minutes before.

The problem for Terrance, of course, is that even if such a scenario is plausible, there's no way I can think of that it could ever be proven. There's no way to trace the origins of what's in a witness's head, to examine the memories and the connections and to neutrally evaluate them and where they may have come from.

[14:44] Rabia Chaudry: What Terrance *can* show though, is that Star might have made the same sort of misnomer to someone else in the house that night. That the night of the shooting, when Detective Hughes interviewed Star, he wrote down that she told him about how Bernard's friend Omar had come over that night with Bernard and Denise. But Denise told police that Omar actually never came in, he just dropped them off and left. And that when she and Bernard went in the house, they found Star already there with another older man, a guy named Sam.

So we know for sure that part of Star's initial statement to Detective Hughes about who was in the house that night was wrong. Because, like we mentioned last episode, Star changed her story at trial and claimed that Omar hadn't dropped Denise and Bernard off at all, that he'd already been in the house with her. Which...sort of fixes her story to match Denise's statements, but it doesn't fix the underlying problem. Unfortunately, it doesn't seem like the police ever spoke to Omar, and we haven't been able to find him either, so there's no record of his version of what happened that night. But based on the evidence available, it's hard to understand how anyone could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Omar was there that night, like Star claims. Although, that same evidence was enough, somehow, for the jury to conclude that Terrance had been there.

And then there's the second evidence of Terrance's guilt, and it's related to the first. JR, Jehmar Gladden, the third man in the house, the one without the gun. Terrance Lewis did know JR, and JR was in the house that night, he's admitted to it. To the prosecution, this is proof that Terrance isn't some poor soul snatched off the street at random, that because he knew JR, it cannot be a coincidence that Star ID'ed him. But it's never been clear to us why the prosecution sees this as a binary, why Terrance either has to be someone with no connection to anyone involved in the murder in any way whatsoever, or else he actually was one of the murderers. The fact Star knew Terrance to be somebody JR knew could equally explain why she remembered his name when she spoke to the police -- the reason Star knew Terrance wasn't because of drugs, but because she knew his uncle and knew his friend JR.

[17:02] Colin Miller And the State's final piece of evidence of Terrance's guilt comes from Terrance's school records. For at least part of his high school years, Terrance went to Overbrook High School in West Philadelphia -- that's also the source of the picture the police used in the lineup, the school ID photo they put into the array to show to Star. And when the police or the prosecutors pulled Terrance's school records, they found that one of the addresses he was registered under was 931 N 63rd Street.

To the State, this too is evidence of Terrance's guilt, because JR also lived at 931 N 63rd Street. That's where the police arrested JR in the summer of 1997, and when they arrested him, they searched his room and found a sawed off shotgun, a rifle, and some 44 caliber ammo. Since that's also the address on Terrance's school records, that connects Terrance to the sawed off shotgun.

But that address, 931 N 63rd Street, isn't where Terrance lived. It's a building in the Overbrook neighborhood where his aunt lived. The building is a pretty large one, with about 158 units, and Terrance's aunt lived in one of them. It also appears to have been in the Overbrook school catchment area, which is likely why Terrance used the address to register for school, even though he lived with his mother halfway across town. But Terrance's aunt and JR's family had units in the same building, which is one reason the two of them knew each other.

The last bit of evidence of Terrance's guilt also comes from his school records. Specifically, his attendance records. In high school, including in 11th grade in the school year before the murder of Bernard Howard, Terrance skipped a lot of class, and to be fair, his grades weren't especially great. Three B's, two C's, three D's. Plus he failed his health education course. The records also show he seemed to skip a lot of classes the

following year too, though it's not entirely clear from the records that Terrance was even really enrolled at Overbrook. Still, you couldn't call him an academic star.

And why does this even matter? Well, it's been used before as proof that Terrance killed Bernard Howard. Because Bernard Howard was killed over a drug debt. And drug dealers are known to sometimes skip school to sell drugs. And Terrance sometimes skipped school too. Therefore, according to the state, ipso facto, Terrance was a drug dealer who killed Bernard Howard.

[19:48] Susan Simpson: But let's go back to JR for a moment. Terrance's co-defendant and, before that, friend. Of all the witnesses, he's the only one who had a personal connection to Terrance, who was friends with him, who might have had a motive to tell a lie to help him out. The other witnesses in the case, the other outside witnesses who saw the men leaving and going to the house that night, they have been dismissed by prosecutors as opportunistic or confused or who knows what, but JR is the only one of them who could really be said to have any bias in Terrance's favor.

But is that really a reason to dismiss his testimony?

According to JR's testimony at the habeas, yeah, he had been at the house that night, and so had two other young men who were there to collect a drug debt, but he said, he hadn't been with the other two. He'd been on his own, and the other two men, neither of them, for sure, were Terrance Lewis. Terrance Lewis, he said, wasn't there, had never been there. He had gotten screwed over more than anyone else in the entire case.

[20:59] Susan Simpson According to JR's version of events, he'd known Star pretty well, because he'd been her drug dealer, and sometimes he dealt drugs to others out of the house she shared with Bernard on Sansom Street. The whole story, he said, had really started about three nights before the murder, when he'd spent the evening dealing crack out of Bernard's basement. Or at least trying to, but business had been bad:

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

It was slow, so I'm deciding to go home. I'm tired and there's no money coming through. So Star knows that I'm about to leave because she's there with me. And she's always trying to get something from me.

So I said, "Look, I'm about to bounce." You know, "I'm gone." She's saying, "Now you miss out on all the late night money, . . . because when the corners close down, everybody come through here to buy and to smoke." So I said [. . .] "All

*right. Well, look, I'll leave a few bags with you, about \$90 worth of product." []
[W]hich would be the equivalent of nine bags -- nine dime bags of cocaine.*

[21:48] Susan Simpson: So JR left for the night, and left the bags with Star, for her to try and sell. And when JR went upstairs, he saw why business had been so bad that night. Because a guy named Mellow and his partner were sitting up there on the porch, dealing from the house as well. According to JR, he'd known of Mellow, but it wasn't really someone he knew, or interacted with, and Mellow and his partner were not pleased at all to see JR at Bernard's.

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

[Mellow] jumps up and says, What you doing in my house? I said, "Your house?" He said, Yeah, my house. And he's like coming towards, you know, in an aggressive nature... I said, you know, "I'm here. This is where I'm at." So he says, "Man, you ain't supposed to be in here. What you doing in my house?" And Mr. Howard tried to come in between and, you know, break things up. "Calm down. Everything is alright."

[22:34] Susan Simpson: According to JR, there's some more posturing and cursing, but finally JR just wanted to get out of there, and he said, "Yeah man, it's your house, fine." And then he left. And that was it, for then. Then, two or three days later, at about 10:45pm one evening, JR got a message on his beeper, which took voicemails. It was from Bernard, and he wanted JR to come over, and bring him some cocaine with him. JR was only a few blocks away at the time, so he got up and headed down the street, to bring a package over to Bernard's house.

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

I knock on the door, and a few moments later Mr. Howard opens the door. I come in. He ushers me in onto the porch and he says, "What's up? You holding?" I said, "Of course." Well, I was jumping, because I could hear, you know, the excitement in his voice. I can look at him and his eyes is already bulging. He smells like an ashtray, so I know he's already pretty much high. I said, "Yeah, I have something small." Basically saying I don't have a large package but I have a small package, probably about maybe \$150 worth of product on me.

So he says, "All right. All right. Come on, let's go." So he ushers me into the house through the living room. By the time I stepped foot into the dining area, I can see that Mello and his partner is in there standing in the kitchen, along with a

taller, old man. He's slim. And he has a woman in there. Her name is Denise. [] And Star is sitting in at the table to the far end.

So upon me seeing these guys, I'm like, oh, come on. I look at Bernard like, "Are you serious, man? You know I just went through basically a beef with these guys a couple days prior to." But Bernard is like, "It's alright. Everything is alright."

[24:06] Susan Simpson: Everything was not all right, though. When they're all in the kitchen, it's instantly clear that Mellow and his partner were there to collect a debt.

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

[Mellow]'s pretty much beating [Bernard] up, like verbally abusing him. Like, Man, you gonna get me my -- the money my F'ing money and so forth? And the other guy, he's standing there just looking, like he's eating this all up, like this is pretty much comical to him. And the old man and Denise, they're just -- they're stocked still, like they're not saying anything.

[24:30] Susan Simpson: JR decides that he's not going to let the fact that Mellow and his friend are there intimidate him, and he decides to use the opportunity to collect on his own debt, from Star:

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

. . . So as he's in the middle of berating Mr. Howard about his money, and I see this. I said, "Man, this is the last thing that I needed." But I'm trying to not have some I would say anxiousness, but I'm also going to show some bravado, like I'm not standing there, I'm not scared. But internally I'm going to keep it real, or as we would say, you know, be honest, I'm, you know, a little intimidated. So I'm talking to Star. "Look, Star, what's up? You got that for me so we can take care of this so I can keep it moving?" She's like, "Uh, uh." I said, "Well, what's up?" She said, "Well, I got this." And she threw a \$20 bill on the table. She reached in her pocket and put a \$20 bill on the table.

[25:13] Susan Simpson: According to JR, Star still owed him the \$90 from the bags he'd left with her a few nights before. So he asks her for the rest of the money, and she didn't have it -- the implication being that she smoked the bags herself, rather than sold them. JR sounds like he's frustrated in his testimony, but not particularly surprised by this outcome. And anyway, the more concerning action going on that night wasn't involving him and Star, but Bernard and Mellow and his partner.

JR (narrated by Rabia Chaudry):

[Mellow's] just dragging it on, dragging it on. It's like beating a dead horse because the man keeps saying he doesn't have it. He doesn't have it. So while he's still beating, you know, this dead horse . . . Then he starts jabbing. "You gonna get my money -- F'ing money. Get my F'ing money, Bernard." And so I'm trying not to pay attention to this, like, trying not to let it affect me, . . . [but] I'm getting nervous. And as he's jabbing, [. . .] Mr. Howard is saying, "Man, you gonna disrespect me in my own house? . . . Man, you disrespecting me in my -- in front of my company." And he pushes him. "Man, turn around. Get my" -- and the -- and the gun goes pop. And once it goes pop, that was enough for me. And I spin I see Mr. Howard is falling, and I spin into the dining area. . . . like I said, I don't know if this man's gonna shoot. He's standing there with a shotgun, and I'm not trying to get shot with a shotgun. I spin and I dip into the dining area. . . [and] you hear the guy who had the shotgun say, "Man, you dickhead."

[26:34] Colin Miller: And then JR splits. He gets out of the house as fast as he can and walks up on the street and on his way, trying to leave whatever just happened behind him.

If JR's story is true, than he would also be wrongfully convicted of Bernard's murder. JR didn't have a gun with him, he didn't shoot anyone, so his conviction for second degree murder is based on his alleged concerted action with the triggerman Mellow. But if they weren't there together, if Mellow and his partner went in separately, and JR just happened to be there at the same time... well, then he's not guilty.

But that's *if* JR's story is true. And it's not unfair to wonder if JR's story isn't just a little too convenient. He was there to deliver crack to Bernard and collect money from Star, and just coincidentally at the same time two other guys were there to collect money from Bernard as well. Now on the other hand, there are the outside witnesses, the one who saw the three men come and go. All of them generally remember three young men going into and leaving the house that night. But at least three of them -- Kizzi Baker, Tiffany Davis, and Keith Christian -- don't remember all three of the guys being together. Two of the guys pulled up in a car and then went in the house, and then a third guy came up the street and went in after. The men left separately too, with one on foot and the other two in the car.

Which kinda supports JR's version of events. If the three men didn't arrive together, that would suggest pretty strongly that they weren't acting in concert, though it doesn't necessarily prove it either.

[27:53] Susan Simpson: I'm left feeling uncertain of what to make of JR's story, one way or another. Based on the evidence we have, it's just hard to have any strong convictions at all about what happened. There's just not enough there to make me feel comfortable accepting JR's story at face value. On the other hand, after seeing how the whole case was handled, and seeing the evidence there is, I don't really have confidence in the evidence against him, either.

But here's why I think JR's story still matters a lot. Because yes, JR was a friend of Terrance's, and yes that could give him a motive to help lie to help Terrance out by coming forward to say that yes he'd seen it, but no Terrance hadn't been there. But the cost to himself in doing so was monumental. By acknowledging he was in the house, that he was present at the shooting, by doing what his trial attorney warned him not to do, he gave evidence incriminating himself, almost certainly damaging, perhaps irreversibly, his own hopes of ever going home. Whether JR is truly guilty or just a really unlucky bystander, by coming forward to say on the record, and testifying at the habeas hearing, that Terrance Lewis hadn't been in the house but he had, there's a good chance he sacrificed his chance of ever securing release.

[30:37] Rabia Chaudry: As for Terrance's own chances, well, recently there's been a new development in his case, something to add to his post-conviction claims in addition to the outside witnesses that have come forward to say Terrance wasn't there.

Earlier this year, his attorney was able to obtain, for the first time, access to some of the additional police files in the investigation into the murder of Hulon Bernard Howard. There were copies of the photo lineups that had been used, activity reports from the officers investigating the case, and loose pages of notes apparently taken by the officers involved.

And there was one page of handwritten notes that we've come to refer to as the Omar 60 & Walnut notes. Because that's what the very top line of the page says. It's also why, at least at first, it seemed as if these notes may have come from a police interview with Omar, Bernard's friend who Star had claimed had been in the house when Bernard was murdered.

[31:30] Colin Miller (reading notes):

Omar /// 60 & Walnut

Denise Sista 61 & Locust / 60 & Market St.

Stink ■ 18

Blue Car

Stink - goes by Hakim Sadeh Muhammed
(House arrest) - bracelet

19

"J.R." - goes by Raheem *Grey Cavalier*

↓

Works out at Bally's

Not sure where Bernard got shot.
Saw hole in stomach.

63 & Oxford

Mello - could be Jamal
tan

■ 61 ■ Walnut St. ■

John Parson → [phone number] Friend of decedent

Late thirties 61 & Walnut St.

Knows what was going on[,] bought drugs off these guys

[32:17] Susan Simpson: It was instantly clear that the notes were important, but it wasn't clear exactly in what way. The notes do make a little bit more sense when you see them laid out on the page, but there's no heading, no date, no obvious signifier of where the notes come from.

Whoever was being interviewed when these notes were taken, it had to have been one of the other witnesses who was in the house that night when Bernard Howard was killed, because whoever it is saw the gunshot wound.

[32:40] Susan Simpson: Which doesn't leave us with many possibilities. Two possibilities, to be precise. One of the possibilities was that the notes came from Denise, the other woman in the house with Bernard and Star. The police did interview Denise, at least three times, so maybe they had a fourth interview with her, one we

didn't know about. But the notes it turns out, could not have come from her. After looking that them, they just don't match up with anything Denise has said. For instance, Denise didn't even know the names of Mellow, JR, or Stink. So, it's not her. Initially, then, we thought these notes must have come from the other option -- Omar, the other older man supposedly in the house that night. That seemed to make sense -- after all, it's his name that's on the first line of the page. We didn't have anything else from the file that suggested that the police might have actually found or spoken to Omar, but maybe they had, maybe there had been an interview at some point, and this page here was the only record of their conversation with him.

Which would be a big deal, if that's what the notes are. It would mean that the police had a witness, who had identified someone who was not Terrance as the murderer, and that the police had been told that the man in the house that night with a shotgun, the one that Terrance supposedly is, was someone who went by the name Hakim Sadeh Muhammad and who was on house arrest and had an ankle bracelet for GPS monitoring at the time.

And that was really interesting, and important for the case that this other witness came forward and we had never heard about it before, but I couldn't quite square the idea that the notes came from Omar with anything else in the case file. None of it lined up right.

[34:21] Susan Simpson: Then one day, I was scanning the page of notes again, trying to figure out what they meant, when the obvious occurred to me. There weren't just two possible witnesses that these notes could have come from, there were three: Denise, Omar... and Star.

I think I hadn't realized it before because the idea seemed ridiculous. It should be ridiculous, anyway. The Omar 60 & Walnut notes were from someone who gave the police answers that were startlingly different from what Star told the detectives in her official interviews, and completely contradicted the prosecutor's case at trial. And while I'll admit to sometimes having a cynical view when it comes to the things law enforcement is willing to do to make their case, I think it simply didn't occur to me that Star -- the state's only eyewitness -- could have told the police that the actual killer was someone who absolutely could not be Terrance Lewis, and that the State would have then completely ignored and covered up this fact and proceeded to convict Terrance Lewis of the murder.

But it seems like that's did happen here. Because after reviewing all of the files that have been made available to us so far, there's no other conclusion that's sustainable.

These notes came from statements that Star herself made to the police on August 19th, 1996.

And we know that in part because there's an activity sheet in the file that reports Detective Hughes' activities that day. The report reads:

"On 8/19/96, the assigned spoke to the witness, Lena Laws."

And the contents of the Omar 60 & Walnut notes confirm that these were the notes that were taken during this August 19th interview with Star herself, with Lena Laws. These notes are a record of what Star told the police that day.

For instance, the very first line of the notes, "Omar 60 & Walnut," appears to be a response to an officer's question about where Omar lives. Only, the answer doesn't seem to be correct; there's no record of Omar ever having an address at 60th & Walnut, not that I've seen. But, that is an answer we've seen before – it's what Star told Detective Hughes on August 7th, the first time he asked her where Omar lived. "60th and Walnut," she told him.

The rest of the notes fall in line in the same way. The addresses given for Denise and Denise's family, the places Denise hangs out – they're all the same that answers Star has given in other recorded interviews, or in her trial testimony. And they're also answers that are slightly incorrect or slightly imprecise. They aren't answers that either Omar or Denise would have given if they were answering these questions for themselves. For now, I'll spare you the line-by-line dissection of the notes, but we'll post a summary on our website that breaks down the contents of the notes in detail. And shows why, eventually, after doing everything I could to try and show these notes did *not* come from Star, I finally realized there was only one possible conclusion here. That these notes – Yeah. They came from Star.

Which means that Star told the police that the killer with the shotgun was someone who is not, and who cannot be, Terrance Lewis.

[39:54] Susan Simpson: Let's go back to what the notes say about the man Star called Stink. The page reads:

"Stink, 18, blue car. Stink goes by Hakim Sadeh Muhammad." And then below that: "House arrest- bracelet."

The fact Star calls the guy she said was Stink by the name “Hakim Sadeh Muhammad” is a big deal on its own, because it’s not a name that’s been linked to Terrance and it’s not a name Star uses to identify anyone at trial, but the note written below that name is more important, still. “House arrest – bracelet.” That seems to be a clear reference to someone on house arrest and GPS monitoring, and that’s someone who can’t be Terrance. Terrance had no prior record, no previous arrests... he wasn’t on house arrest. But whoever Star was describing to the police... seems like he was.

After talking to Terrance’s attorney David Laigaie about the notes, he decided that this was something that Philadelphia’s Conviction Review Unit needed to hear about. So, last month, I went up to Philly and met with him and the attorneys at the CRU, and since then, Assistant District Attorney Andrew Wellbrock has been looking at the Omar 60 & Walnut notes as well.

He’s the one who figured out something I missed originally – that these notes didn’t just come from some random police officer. The handwriting, with its vaguely 18th century looking loopy cursive flourishes, comes from none other than Detective Hughes himself, the lead detective on the case.

[41:11] Susan Simpson: And we know that Detective Hughes took Star’s statement to him about Hakim Sadeh Muhammad seriously, because he followed up on them, or at least tried to. There’s another page of handwritten notes from the file that lays out some of the police work that they did after this following the interview and the info star gave them. It has the names or IDs number of five different men scribbled down, and at least one of them was known by the nickname Hakim Muhammad, because that’s written down, and his real name is given as well.

Andrew Wellbrock looked into this list, and it turns out that all of the men on it had at some point or another been arrested and had given the police a name or an alias that sounded kind of like, or was the the name Hakim Muhammad. But, beyond pulling this list of names, it doesn’t seem like the police did anything more, really, to follow up on this lead. Even though at least one of the men, one of the Hakim Muhammads on the list seems like someone you’d at least want to check out. 19 years old, from West Philly, arrested just five days after Bernard Howard’s murder for assault, robbery, and carrying a firearm... But they don’t follow up on it. And yeah, that could all be a coincidence, easily, with no connection whatsoever to Bernard Howard’s death, but what I can’t understand is why the police don’t seem to have tried to investigate him further. The obvious next step would’ve been to put his photo in a photo array and show it to Star and see if she identifies anyone on it, but that never happened. They didn’t do that.

None of the photos in any of the photo arrays that were shown to Star came from any of the men on this list of names of possible Hakim Muhammeds.

And there's one other detail that Star gave Detective Hughes that might have helped them find the shotgun wielder, although it doesn't seem like they ever tried to look into that one either. And that's the fact that the guy Star was identifying as the shotgun wielder in the house that night was apparently on house arrest with a GPS monitoring bracelet.

[42:44] Susan Simpson: From news reports, it turns out that ankle monitoring as a form of pre-trial detention was kind of a hot button issue in Philly back in '96. Several murders and rapes had been committed by people who had walked away from home arrest, either because they had cut the bracelet off, or because they had left their homes in the evenings. Philadelphia only monitored people on house arrest during the day, during business hours- more or less. So when the staff left at night, there was no one monitoring the machines and someone on house arrest couldn't be detected if they left. For instance, in December of 1995 a convicted child rapist who was on home arrest while awaiting sentencing waited until 9pm on Christmas eve to leave his house and flee the country, and no one in the probation department noticed until two days later. He was eventually arrested in April of '96, and what's relevant for Terrance's case is that the articles from the Philadelphia Inquirer about this whole little mini-scandal mention that in the spring of '96 there were only about 300 people in all of Philadelphia on house arrest at the time – which means the total pool of people Star could have been referring to when she told the cops about the “house arrest- bracelet” couldn't be that big. But if the police ever tried to get the list of house arrestees, it's not in any part of the files I've seen or had access too, and that's a dead end for now.

[44:00] Susan Simpson: But while these clues as to who Star might have been referring to are intriguing, what matters more is that, according to these notes, Star told the police that the shotgun wielder was someone who can't be Terrance. There's no indication that the Omar Walnut & 60 notes were ever disclosed to the defense at any point prior to 2017, but if they had been disclosed before trial, it would have changed everything. I just don't see how Terrance could've been convicted if his attorney had been given access to the notes – they eliminate the one piece of evidence that the State had against him.

Terrance was only convicted because the jury decided they had no reason to doubt that Star was accurately able to identify the man in the house that night as Terrance Lewis. And without her ID being credible, there's nothing left in the state's case. But as the

prosecutor repeatedly told the jury in opening and closing statements, Star was able to identify Terrance instantly, and never hedged or hesitated in making her ID.

[45:00] As the prosecutor told jury in opening arguments:

Narrated by Rabia Chaudry:

[Star] told the police on the scene exactly what happened. She quickly identified each of the co-defendants at the bar of the court. ... She knew them only by nickname from coming around the house, but she knew their faces well. The witness will come in today and she will tell you exactly who she saw. She said it from the very she said what she saw from the initial evening that this occurred, and she stuck with her account of what happened from that day to this.

Susan Simpson: In closing arguments, the prosecutor told the jury much the same:

[45:25] Narrated by Rabia Chaudry: This is a virtually perfect case. This is not a whodunnit. You have an eyewitness who knows each of the three co-defendants well, this is not a stranger who had to pick these men out, this is somebody who knows them. Lena Laws, Star, knew each of these men quite well, and . . . from that day to this she tells who the individuals are who are involved, it's Mellow, it's Stink, and it's JR, and what the involvement is of each of those individuals, and she sticks with her account of what happened from that day to this.

[45:52] Susan Simpson: What the jury *didn't* hear is that this isn't true at all. Star *didn't* stick with the same story from that day to this. That in fact she had described Stink as being someone who cannot be Terrance. Eight months later, eight months after the interview that the Omar 60 and Walnut notes came from, Star would pick Terrance's face out of the photo array, but the person she thought she was picking out of that lineup was someone that she thought went by the name Hakim Muhammad, and who had once been on house arrest. For all we know, if Star had been told the person whose photo she picked out had never worn an GPS tracking bracelet, she might've retracted the identification herself, told the police that she must've gotten the wrong guy, that the photo she'd pointed to couldn't possibly be the person she was referring to.

Instead, it seems like from the files, that the City of Philadelphia just decided that everyone would be better off, really, if they simply pretended that Star had never identified someone other than Terrance Lewis as the actual killer.

[46:58] Colin Miller: So how does this all effect Terrance's case? Well, the evidence that Star identified someone else as "Stink" before she identified Terrance Lewis would strongly support a *Brady* violation based upon the failure to disclose what we have called material exculpatory evidence. The opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Smith v. Cain* is instructive in this matter. That case also involved several men involved in an armed robbery that resulted in a murder (actually five murders). Also, like in this case, the State in that case presented a sole eyewitness (Larry Boatner) to the crimes, who identified the defendant as one of the gunmen. In *Smith*, after he was convicted, the defendant obtained files from the police investigation of his case, including those of the lead investigator, Detective John Ronquillo. Ronquillo's notes contain[ed] statements by Boatner that conflict with his testimony identifying [the defendant] as a perpetrator. The notes from the night of the murder state that Boatner "could not ... supply a description of the perpetrators other than [*sic*] they were black males." Ronquillo also made a handwritten account of his conversation he had with Boatner five days after the crime, in which Boatner said he "could not ID anyone because [he] couldn't see faces" and "would not know them if [he] saw them." And Ronquillo's typewritten report of that conversation states that Boatner told Ronquillo he "could not identify any of the perpetrators of the murder." [*Smith v. Cain*, 565 U.S. 73 (2012) (internal citations omitted).]

Now, in *Smith v. Cain*, The Supreme Court found that failure to disclose this evidence constituted a *Brady* violation because Boatner's identification was the only evidence against the defendant and the undisclosed statements directly contradicted his testimony. The Court was able to reach this conclusion despite the fact "that Boatner made other remarks on the night of the murder indicating that he could identify the first gunman to enter the house, but not the others." [*Id.*] According to the Court, "[T]hat merely leaves us to speculate about which of Boatner's contradictory declarations the jury would have believed."

[48:35] Colin Miller: Now my conclusion is that Terrance's case is similar to *Smith's* case and arguably stronger. If our interpretation is correct, Star didn't merely state uncertainty about the identity of "Stink;" she in fact said it was someone other than Terrance Lewis. Also, unlike in *Smith*, Star never stated an ability to identify Terrance on the night of the shooting. She unequivocally stated that she did not know Stink's real identity, and only later gave a description of the individual she knew as Stink, which, if correct, excludes the possibility that Terrance Lewis is the person Star was referring to, as Terrance did not have an ankle monitoring device. Finally, unlike Boatner, the witness in *Smith v. Cain*, Star admitted to smoking crack shortly before the event she observed, and gave statements that contradicted the physical evidence in the case.

Assuming that the files containing this information were in the sole possession of the State and never previously disclosed to the defense, this information is new evidence that could not have been discovered through due diligence – which means this *Brady* claim would not have been waived and can be brought now.

Although from what we've seen, it does not appear that anyone on the defense side has ever seen these notes until a few months ago, even if it turned out otherwise, that wouldn't mean all would be lost for Terrance in this case. Even if a court were to find that the *Brady* claim had been waived, Terrance has an advantage here that not all defendants do: as a juvenile lifer, he's entitled to be resentenced. And after his resentencing hearing, any previously waived claims could now be brought, because it is the sentence and not the conviction that governs criminal appeals.

[50:00] Rabia Chaudry And then there's the option we mentioned at the close of last week, the Conviction Review Unit, or CRU. As the name implies, a conviction review unit, or a conviction integrity unit as they're known in some jurisdictions, is a body that explores the integrity of prior convictions. Typically, conviction integrity units are run out of local district attorney's offices, with the people who usually prosecute crimes now tasked with exploring whether prior prosecutions led to wrongful convictions.

It's widely believed that the first conviction integrity unit was started in Dallas in 2007, followed by Harris County, which includes Houston, in 2009. At last count, in 2016, there were 29 CRUs across the country that have handed out 225 exonerations, with a record 70 exonerations coming in 2016 alone.

It's important to note, though, that these numbers haven't been evenly distributed. According to a report by the National Registry of Exonerations, 15 out of the 29 CRU units haven't handed down a single exoneration, and 85% of all CIU exonerations have come from only four counties: Harris County, Dallas County, Kings County covering Brooklyn, and Cook County covering Chicago.

So, why have so many conviction integrity units not had a single exoneration? A big part of the problem is staffing. When Philadelphia started its CRU, in 2014, it only had one part time attorney working for it, the district attorney who prosecuted the Willie Veasy case. And coming into 2017, Philadelphia's CRU hasn't issued a single exoneration. In late 2017, Colin spoke with Assistant District Attorney Andrew Wellbrock, then the Assistant Director of Philadelphia's CRU:

[51:44] Andrew Wellbrock

In January of 2017, or really December 2016, my colleague B.J. Graham-Rubin and I were asked if we would assist in rebooting the Conviction Review Unit of the Philadelphia DA's office. It was established in April of 2014, I believe, or 2015, and had a single part-time prosecutor working on it who was pulled off to handle a couple of other special cases. So, we were told to put together protocol to take in some of the Quintrone Center's research and talk to some other outside agencies, such as the Pennsylvania Innocence Project, and put together a protocol that would allow us to openly and transparently and independently evaluate cases alleging actual innocence.

[52:29] Rabia Chaudry: According to Wellbrock, at the time, the Philadelphia CRU has received 118 submissions from inmates seeking review of their convictions. The key question for the CRU is often whether the submission meets its initial guidelines:

[52:41] Andrew Wellbrock

All right, so for a case alleging actual innocence to meet our initial guidelines, the case must be out of Philadelphia county - we actually get a bunch throughout the state because we are the only Conviction Review Unit in the state; the petitioner must still be alive; there must a claim of actual innocence, meaning not a legal issue, although we recognize that there is some overlap between the two; credible evidence of innocence must exist, and the claim must not be frivolous. A frivolous claim would be one that has no bearing on the final determination. So, of the 118, about half of them we were able to dispose of as not meeting those entry level criteria, 2 we reached to a final determination. We have about 6 open right now, and whatever that remaining number is, probably about 40, those have not yet been reviewed.

[53:32] Rabia Chaudry: If you listed to our series on the Shaurn Thomas case, you know his case was one of the two that reached resolution as he became the first person exonerated by the CRU last May after they reviewed his case for about six months. The other case is one we haven't reported on, but that involves another client of the Pennsylvania Innocence Project, with the review taking about eight months. And then, there are the cases where the CRU ruled against defendants:

[53:56] Andrew Wellbrock:

Other than those 60 that we declined outright, there is another 15 that we accepted for initial investigation, and then after that more thorough review,

whether that's reviewing old documents, interviewing people, there are 15 that we decided to reject the claim on its merits.

Colin Miller:

OK. And was that you think the general same time frame you said for the 2 cases that had outcomes of throwing out the conviction?

Andrew Wellbrock:

You know, it depends. Ah, the first one only took us about two months 'cus it was kind of straightforward? Uh, what we've committed to do is to make sure that the petitioner if they are pro se, or if it's the attorney, are aware that we've received their submission and are looking at it. We wanted to avoid a situation where someone is sitting in jail and wondering if we've even received their letter. So one of the number one things we've done is increased communication.

Colin Miller:

Uh-huh. Is there a particular burden of proof that you apply, or does it sort of depend on each of the members of the CRU to assess what it takes?

Andrew Wellbrock:

It can certainly depend. The bottom line we say is clear and convincing evidence of innocence, but that depends on each person. You know, it's like, you asking a jury what their definition of reasonable doubt is, that can also vary.

Colin Miller:

And Is it a majority vote, or do you require unanimity?

Andrew Wellbrock:

So, it's a majority vote to go to the District Attorney. And then the District Attorney has the final decision. So that's...the voting I guess members would be the two members of the Conviction Review Unit, the Director and myself, and then those would go to our Deputy who's the next level up in the chain of command, and if there's a majority vote after that the case would then go to the District Attorney.

[55:41] Colin Miller: That said, it might take time. While the CRU has better staffing now than when it only had one part-time attorney, it's still probably understaffed:

[55:49] Colin Miller:

And how many current members are there on the CRU?

Andrew Wellbrock:

So it's myself, the Assistant Director, the Director B.J. Graham-Rubin, and a paralegal. And then we have the investigative resources of the office to assist in any investigation, so meaning the 30-some prosecution detectives are available to us,

[56:09] Colin Miller: Of course, that might all be about to change. I spoke with Wellbrock soon after the election of new district attorney Larry Krasner, and I asked him about what changes his election might bring to the CRU:

[56:20] Andrew Wellbrock:

That's a conversation I haven't had yet. He could probably better answer that. Yeah, I mean I think it's important for a prosecutor's office to have such a unit. I think the community expects it, and I think it's a healthy thing in terms of legitimacy for law enforcement, so I'd be hopeful that more resources would be devoted for it, ah, that, you know, we didn't have 30-40 cases awaiting our review. The more resources, the more dedicated investigations you could have to...um, a unit like this, the more thorough results you're going to have. You can't measure the success of a conviction review unit by the amount of exonerations, because perhaps you're in a jurisdiction where there aren't significant issues in convictions. But you don't know that until you look at them. So, I'd like to be able to say that we've reviewed 120 cases, and conducted extensive investigations of all of them, and here's what we have.

[57:20] Colin Miller: We might already be seeing some of the effects of the transitions of the Krasner administration, specifically in the Johnny Berry case. The Johnny Berry case involves a defendant much like Terrance Lewis. Johnny Berry was a juvenile offender who got life imprisonment based upon allegedly taking part in a robbery and murder in the mid-'1990s in Philadelphia. And, like Terrance Lewis, Berry had a submission to the CRU, a pending resentencing hearing, and a claim of actual innocence. Indeed, both claims of actual innocence share a similar feature: like Terrance Lewis, Berry has an alleged accomplice who says he is innocent.

Now, as reported by Samantha Melamed, he can continue to fight his conviction on the street instead of in prison. That's because Berry's attorneys negotiated a deal with Larry Krasner's office allowing for a new sentence of 23 years to life that makes Berry immediately eligible for parole. And in terms of Berry's claim of actual innocence, the

DA's office has confirmed that *"the review of the case will continue irrespective of whether the petitioner is resentenced."*

[58:17] Susan Simpson: At the start of the year, Larry Krasner was sworn in as the new District Attorney for Philadelphia. Before the election last year, Rabia spoke to him about his approach to criminal justice reform and the role of prosecutors in the criminal justice system, and if you haven't already checked it out, you should listen to his interview at Addendum 3 of our series on Shaurn Thomas's case.

Krasner has only been in office a few weeks now, but I spoke to him about his plans for Philadelphia's Conviction Review Unit, and it's clear that changes are under way for the office.

[58:44] Larry Krasner:

We are excited about the arrival in early February of a new supervisor of this unit who has experience in the field, meaning in supervising a conviction review or conviction integrity unit elsewhere, and who also has a long career in criminal justice and a lot of knowledge of the foibles of the system.

[59:06] Susan Simpson: For the moment, though, the CRU in Philadelphia is like many of the Conviction Integrity Units around the country: underfunded and facing a huge mission:

[59:14] Larry Krasner:

We have at this point essentially one person doing the best he can with caseload, and this is a unit that should be expanded. I would love to see, this as a unit that has 5-6-7 people, including a dedicated investigator or two. We can find a way to make that possible. That is what's been recommended by the Innocence Project, and it seems to be an obtainable goal as long as we can find support in the jurisdiction that is about as poorly funded as any major city in the United states.

[59:48] Susan Simpson: That one person, by the way, is Andrew Wellbrock. And particularly when it comes to the Conviction Review Unit, Krasner's focus includes making sure that its staffed by people who believe in its mission.

[59:57] Larry Krasner:

When we all get into the technocratic talk, which criminal justice reformers *love* to engage in, a lot of times what is lost in the process is the character of the people

involved. You can talk all day and all night about how the local prosecutors should never prosecute officer involved shootings, and it should go to some other prosecutor, but there is some sort of a presumption there that the other prosecutor will be without guile, without motivation, that may be undue and political, but that's just not necessarily the case. In many ways the most important thing is simply the character of the people involved in doing the job of the unit. If you have people who are competent and on paper independent, but they believe confessions are dispositive, then you don't have a real unit, because confessions are *not* dispositive. 30% of people, 25-30% of people who are exonerated on DNA confessed. That's science. You know, you gotta make sure the people running the show are open minded enough to be open to the science. It's no surprise to anybody in the system who's fair that innocent people confess, and yet it sounds like that may have been a problem.

[1:01:10] Susan Simpson: And as for Terrance Lewis, well, there's at least one way in which Krasner's election may give new hope for his case.

[1:01:16] Larry Krasner:

You know an innocence claim in my view shouldn't be reason to slow down release when that person would be released if guilt is assumed.

[1:01:24] Susan Simpson: That Catch-22 that Terrance has found himself stuck in -- where he can't proceed with resentencing as a juvenile lifer because he is also asserting claims of actual innocence -- is a procedural injustice that Krasner is aware of, and believes should be remedied.

[1:01:37] Larry Krasner:

You know the court system has its own administrative process, which is not necessarily determined by the DA. And sometimes they put cases in different buckets. And when they take a juvenile lifer case where there's an innocence claim and putting him in a different bucket, that should not be slowed down simply because there's an innocence claim. If anything it should be handled on exactly the same basis or maybe have expedited review. Because, we are, you know every day in jail for an innocent person is an injustice. And regardless, whatever, regardless of whatever system is set up by the courts, I think there's an obligation on DA's to look at cases with a substantial innocence claim involving juvenile lifers quickly.

[1:02:20] Susan Simpson: And as for Terrance's claims of innocence, well, although this is our last episode, for now, in this series on Terrance's case, this is not the end of the investigation. I know the CRU is taking Terrance's claims seriously, and is pursuing new leads and old witnesses, and I am hopeful that we have more to learn yet about the events leading up to Terrance's conviction.

[1:03:13] Rabia Chaudry: A big, big thank you to everybody who made this very important series possible. I have to begin by thanking the folks at the Pennsylvania Innocence Project: Marissa, Riley, Jim - you guys do amazing work, and your entire teams. Thank you to Mital Telhan, as our executive producer, thanks for keeping us going. Baluki, thank you so much for designing our logo, a big thanks to Patrick Cortez and Ramiro Marquez for our theme music, thank you to all of our sponsors for making it possible for us to come back week after week. Audio production is done by Rebecca LaVoie of Partners in Crime Media, and she is the host of one of my favorite podcasts by the way, Crime Writers On. Do not miss it. Definitely check it out. Don't forget to send any questions you have to us over Twitter and use the hashtag #UDAddendum to tag those questions so we can respond to them in the addendum. And don't forget to follow us online. On all our social media our handle is @UndisclosedPod. That's Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. Thanks so much for listening.