

WHAT I NEED OF YOUR SERVICES

1) Exhibit 13 Bruce Nash last seen Rita Cobb at the Sullivan drinking party, He stated;

- a) That she had been drinking burboun about 1945 hours
- b) That he and his giu/rlfriend offered to take Rita home because she was more drunk than usual
- c) That she refused his offer to take her home stating that she was noty going home but was gouing to a bar calle d the Zodiac Lounge instead
- d) That he and Cynthisa left the aprty about 2145 hours

Nash made this exact statement to police in 1985 and 2009. That Rita refused his offer to drive her home, and he left her there drinking with Frabncesca and John Sullivan

On the stand Bruce stated the same onlyu now he changed rita's last declaration to suggesting she was going home after the party.

I need you to contact him and ask why he changed his statetemt n to the jurors. Did sheriff coerse his statement, why? Then ask him to make a declaration of this interference

THIS HOLDS THIRD PARTY CULPABUILITY FOR GREGORY RANDOLPH

last known PH #'s 760-900-0702 & 760-248-7947

X Ladst known address 32323 Carnelian Lucern Valley 92356

2) Exhibit 14 John Sullivan was the person who threw the party Rita Cobb had last been seen. He stated;

- a) In 1985 stated he had fallen asleep about 2230 hours
- b) That he drank white lightnenign with Rita that night
- c) That shge arrived at the party at 1800 hours

Francesca Sullivan stated;

- a) Rita stated she was dating bruce lee
- b) Thatb Rita was drunk when she left the partyy
- c) That Rita left the aprty about 2330 hours

John gave a different statement in 2009, whil Francesca gave identical statementsa. Johnm gave different statements to the jurors. Can you find out why he changed his story especially since his wife and Bruce Nash gave identical statements.
last known Ph# 760-248 6902 Address 33403 Carnelian rd L.V, Ca. 92356

3) Exhibit 16 Gregory Randolph This man gave several statements over the years beginning 9/25/85 and then another on August 10, 1988 after he had confessed to this case.

- a) In 1985 he stated he had last been at the Cobb residence two weeks before she had been killed
- b) In 1988 he stated that he had last been at the Cobb residence two days before she had been killed
- c) after he had been arrested for this crime on 8/11/88 he stated it had been three to four days before she passed

This man will have an arrest warrant for this murder filed for by Detective Palacios #P0108. This affidavit was never presented and would provide third party culpability issues because he was a prime suspect for this case in 1985 and 1988

This man committed suicide in 1999 and when they processed his suicide scene they found trophies at his residence. I need to know whether these trophies were for unsolved crimes, and whether one of them were for this crime here

All sheriff notes regarding this man's suspect categorization standing for this and any crimes. His training as a county coroner would give his expertise for preservation of DNA at a scene if he were there maliciously as in this confession.....that he killed Rita and then raped her

4) Exhibit 59 This issue presents a complicated possibility because of the detective's testimony regarding a ~~wax~~ fingerprint report that was collected. When asked at trial he stated;

Q- did you get the chance to look at all the evidence to this case ?

A- Yes I did.

Q-Did you take notice of the fingerprint report ?

A- No, I did not

Q- So you don't recall a fingerprint report for this case ?

A- No, not that I can recall

The trial attorney was looking at the fingerprint report I was holding while I nudged him to show the report, he stated it was not necessary. When I argued this later and finally got to see the trial transcripts, they had been altered to saying what exhibit 59 shows.

As you can see the prosecutors closing statement was consistent to what I allege was said at trial, "THAT NO FINGERPRINT REPORT EXISTS". The transcripts were changed to saying something different than the blatant lie told by the detective; Pages 517 and 518 indicate he seen one, but could not recall whether it had been developed, and if it had that he cannot recall the results, but that he knew my prints were not located at this scene.

As you can see the prosecutor closing was accurate with my statement, "THAT NO PRINTS WERE FOUND TESTIMONY" as he told jurors that "THERE WAS NO FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN THIS CASE, AND YOU DID NOT HEAR ANY". This closing is not synonymous to what the detectives testimony was changed to.

Is there a way to validate this altering with the actual court stenographer who created the transcripts Shawna Mannoing No#12827. It would seem that her actual records will show as I said and that there was an altering. The possible access to making the altering. Ordinarily I would argue this is inconsistent to professional integrity but this is the same ass hole who changed my answers in the interrogation.

Is there a way to validate "authenticity" for this specific transcript location. Also whether the detectives statement about the report can this be professionally examined to verify a) it was not according to protocol for statements about records b) That this type of statement was could qualify as being false, perjury regarding a specific piece of evidence.....whether there was a report and those results, etc.

5) Exhibit 59-D Could the prosecutors statement be interpreted as suggesting that the watchband pin located underneath the victims head as being part of her personal collection.

Here is why. When I argued this pin was not examined to prove my DNA was not on it the DDA Ferguson argued back that

- 1) Maybe Rita collected watchband pins and saved this one
- 2) That just because there is another mans DNA on this that because I cannot prove who's it was my argument fails

I would need an expert analysis as to whether this statement by prosecutor was ambiguous, and whether it suggested that that pin was left there by the killer...was that the states evidence.

I will add that my DNA is not on this pin to any degree.

6) Exhibit 40-X This is proofs that two separate transcripts were created on the exact same day from the exact same interrogation recording. I need a report as to whether creating two separate transcript was ordinary policy, and reasons this would be acceptable. There is a 13 page difference. These transcripts are not real, time creations from the original recordings

THE STATE USED THE 113 PAGE AND HID THE 136 page

Exhibit 40-5 and 40-6 show where the answers were changed from my saying I did not have a key to the victims home to saying that I did.. This is not consistant to the actual real time recording. This c shows that the altered version was shown to the jurors .

Here is another theory, because this exhibit 49A was not shown to the jury. In fact another completely different version was created on January 25, 2011 by the prosecutor when he took this home to alter the changed answers to having matching sound./ Redacting historical sound then dubbing sound from another ~~red~~ location to imply "actual answers". States exhibit 49 proves this. The new transcript has vanished, was never placed into the records, while they still placed the altered and unaltered version into the record.

WOULD CHANGING THIS ANSWER CHANGE THE MEANING OF THE RESPONSE?

7) Exhibit 41 This is the Court, prosecutor and trial counsel changing the transcripts trying to make it according to laws so that it can be used. They redacted so much that it made the transcript unreliable and therefore should never have been used.

I need this exhibit 49A to be authenticated with exhibit 49 the compact disc of copies of the real time recordings I have provided a copy of the 113 page transcript. I will then need a report verifying that there were changes.

The changed and altered the meaning of the response
Whether the doctored "copy" was damaged to the point of reliability

As you can see I tried invoking MIRANDA, tried to break custodial and still was forced to the police station. I need a report about how officers are trained to coerce statements, when MIRANDA takes hold, and *WHEN THEY ARE HOLDING AN ARREST WARRANT WHEN BEGINNING INTERROGATION.*

Here is the issue I have with the Courts. They state that collusive allegations are not synonymous to perjury regarding the altered transcript allegations. I have since gotten the compact disc but do not have an expert behind it as being tampered with and unreliable and therefore should never have been used. The DDA stated that this transcript was used to coerce the jurors into a verdict..

Is it possible for an audio expert to authenticate this transcript to show where the alterations are according to sound? Do I actually need to original recording devices. If that is so then I would assume that they are too missing, and damaged beyond use.

It is obvious that these are important, but as far as time there really is no deadline. What I have in the Court now should work without an expert because of their origination, "STATES RECORDS" But that does not mean the Court will review them without an expert opinion of these.

The majority of my habeas argument is prosecutorial misconduct reducing the case to a sham. Trial counsel incompetance who worked with prosecutor to seek a conviction rate.

In my case deception started far before this case went to trial. and I have chronologically recorded all this. Your investigations will prove useful and necessary should I need to re-enter the court.

I need an estimate for an hourly rate and would started in the sequence as outlined in this writing numerically. Some of them may be capable of working on at the same time, other may not.

If you have any questions about this please contact me through my brother Kenneth Yablonsky @ 562-889-7370 KENNETH YABLONSKY @ Yahoo.com

Thank you for your time;

Respectfully John Henry