

Darold R. J. Stenson
Washington State Penitentiary

13 May 2009

Judge Kenneth Williams
Clallam County

I write to you once again to implore you to finally do what is right in my case. I am almost reluctant to do this again considering your lack of action with my previous written requests, in spite of the truth and accuracy that was contained in each of them! In considering your lack of action during these long 16 years, I have often wondered if you even read the contents of my letters! Yet, even now I don't feel that you are an overall bad judge as former Prosecutor Bruneau and his supporters have long claimed. However, in my case you were a very bad judge!

Because of Bruneau's very public bitterness with you in regards to some of your legal decisions and your representation of his ex-wife in their divorce proceedings, coupled with Fred Leatherman's public declaration that he thought that I was guilty and did not merit true legal representation, you had the perfect opportunity to attempt to repair the rift between yourself and Bruneau. All you had to do was agree with each of these lawyers and then deny my every request for fairness and justice! By doing so you could save Clallam County some money and you and Leatherman would not have to change your planned vacations. In good conscience, now, how can you defend or condone the discussion that you and Leatherman had in a sidebar during my trial? This was before my guilt or innocence had been determined by a jury, and you two supposed defenders of justice discussed how to schedule the sentencing phase of my trial so as not to inconvenience either of you with having to change your vacation plans. You both deemed your vacations to be more important than justice was for me!

Then you further showed your bias against myself and my legal rights when both Neupert and Leatherman declared to you that they could not stand the sight of me, that there was no communication at all between us and that they wanted to quit as my appointed lawyers. In disregarding all of our wishes, you cajoled them both into remaining as my counsel. You again did this to save the county money and to not have to change your vacation plans, knowing that I was not being represented by true advocates for my innocence and that the lawyers that you had appointed to defend me had no desire to do so! Justice was then and still is being denied to me because of your decisions.

Please read the declaration of David Neupert where he states that he did nothing to assist me in my defense; he only assisted Fred Leatherman in his religious mission to save my life. Yet the appeal courts have stated that even though Leatherman's defense of me was not as zealous as it could have been, they said that I always had Neupert looking out for my interests. You read these decisions and know that their assumptions were wrong and you again decided to say nothing!

Read Fred Leatherman's declaration where he admits to doing basically nothing that I wanted done for my defense, and that his ego had prevented him from doing what was right by me. Now, even in admitting that he did not defend me, his ego still prevents him from being even more truthful when he tries to excuse his behavior by saying that he was afraid of me! What baloney! He sat right beside every day of my trial. You know that if he had any fear of me at all he would not been in court! He was so mentally bizarre that after my trial he lost his law practice and in fact could not get hired

anywhere as a lawyer! He had to move to Kentucky to take a job teaching in one unaccredited school and when that school was closed down he even lost that job! In all of my now-verified accusations, which I made against him in your court, not once did Fred Leatherman even have the courage to deny the truth that I spoke and wrote! With this in mind, please read the opinions of J. Strait and M. Friedman, both highly acclaimed experts in their fields, where they state that I did not even receive *inassistance* of counsel. I had *no* assistance of counsel and you refused to allow me to present myself as every American is supposed to be able to do!

Read how Prosecutor Bruneau and Det. Martin sat in your court and allowed Mr. Grubb to deny that anyone had ever put my pants on before they were tested by the F.B.I. for the second time. Both Bruneau and Martin knew that this testimony was untrue. Are they not required by law to disclose this untruth and attempt to rehabilitate their witnesses' testimony when they know that it is untrue?

Now look at the recently discovered photographs taken by Mr. Englert at his lab in Portland of Det. Martin wearing my pants! He has the pockets pulled out where the gunpowder residue was found, and he rolls around on the lab floor in an attempt to recreate his version of events. Notice that Martin, in his arrogance and ignorance, does not even have gloves on his hands! Should he not have gloves on at all times especially when he plans to send back the pants to the F.B.I. for testing? You know how easily gunpowder residue can be transferred, and lo and behold, some is found when my pants were sent back to the F.B.I. for a second round of testing. In their rush for a conviction, Martin and Bruneau do not disclose to you or me what was done with my pants nor the existence of these pictures! Since Leatherman was putting up little or no defense for me they figured that no one would ever find it! What Martin and Bruneau did here cannot be written off as "harmless error," because in my appeals, this gunpowder residue has been mentioned over and over as reason for belief in my guilt!

So I again I ask you, Judge Williams, please read my appeal. It and all of my correspondence will be posted at www.stensoninnocence.com. Do not let the murder of an innocent man become your judicial legacy! It is time for you to earn the "honorable" title that the citizens of Clallam County have voted for you to put in front of your name. Demand a new trial for me in which I will be allowed to argue against false evidence and assumptions and finally prove my innocence!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Darold R. J. Stenson