1 Honor.

7:

20.

24:

MR. YIURDIAGA: Mr. Durrough wishes to address the Court.

THE COURT: Yes, sir, Mr. Durrough?

THE DEFENDANT: I'd just like to say this about your duties:

(Reading:)

Four things belong to the Judge, to hear courteously, to answer wisely, to consider soberly and to decide impartially. That's from Socrates.

knowingly use false evidence, including false testimony to obtain a tainted conviction implicit in any concept of ordered liberty does not cease to apply merely because the false testimony goes only to the credibility of a witness.

The jury's estimate of the truthfulness and reliability of a given witness may well be determinative of guilt or innocence, and it is upon such subtle factors as the possible interest of the witness in testifying falsely that a defendant's life or liberty may depend.

As stated by the new Court of Appeals in Napue versus Illinois 360 U.S. 3 L.Ed. 1217: It is no consequence that the falsehood bore upon the witnesses credibility rather than directly upon defendant's guilt.

A lie is a lie, no matter what its subject.

And if it is in any way relevant to the case -- that the

District Attorney's silence was not the result of guilt or a desire to prejudice matters little, for its impact was the same -- preventing, as it did, a trial that could be -- in any real sense -- be determined fair.

1.4

The reasonable doubt standard in a criminal case was bottomed (sic) on the fundamental value determination that it was far worse to convict an innocent man than to let a guilty man go free. Due process commands that no man shall lose his liberty unless the Government has borne the burden of convincing the fact finder of his guilt. To such end, the reasonable doubt standard is indispensable. It is being critical that the moral force of the criminal law not be diluted by a standard of proof which leaves people in doubt whether innocent men are being condemned.

not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all -- whose interest therefore in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense, the servant of the law -- the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer.

He may prosecute vigorously and with ernestness, indeed he should do so. But while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper

methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one.

The search for truth is not served but hindered by the concealment of these things. Although the system of administering criminal justice is adversary in nature, a trial is not a game, its ultimate goal's the ascertainment of truth. And where furtherance of the adversary system comes in conflict with the ultimate goal, the system must give way to reasonable restraints designed to further that goal.

I am going to skip this part here. It is just a personal attack.

In closing, I concur with the comments of counsel and the Court regarding the greatness -- the majesty of America and its democracy.

We've shared much by way of this outrage, this tragedy, but if freedom is to truly reign, then we must also be bold and firm in preserving the guarantees afforded to all by the founding fathers -- The Constitution.

That's it.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Durrough.

Is there anything further you wish to say at this time?

MR. Y3URDIAGA: Umm -- Other than it's been an outrage -- umm -- it's been hypocricy in the nighest order -- no.