

David Kibble continued from page 4

center mass in rapid succession” and the man “immediately dropped the knife and fell to the ground.”

When he was asked to draw on the crime-scene sketch where the men were when they were fighting and where Kibble was when he shot him, Hicks indicated that the fighting occurred in a part of the parking lot close to the alley and that Kibble was in the middle of the alley when he shot him. No blood was found at either of these locations. But that wasn't the only oddity about Hicks' statement. Among the other questions it raised were:

- If Kibble “immediately dropped the knife and fell to the ground,” when Hicks shot him in the middle of the alley, how did both Kibble and the knife end up in the grass by a fence more than 10 feet farther south?
- If Hicks shouted several times at the men to get them to stop fighting and several more times for Kibble to drop the knife, why didn't the other police officers or any of the witnesses say they heard his repeated shouts? And why wouldn't the other officers have rushed to his aid as he kept shouting for Kibble to “drop it”?
- If Hicks was standing where he said he was, how did two of the casings from his weapon – which usually only travel a few feet to the side — end up 18 and 22 feet further away?
- Why did Alan Dukes, Donnell Broomfield and Freddie Kibble, the three known witnesses to the shooting, say David Kibble was being chased at the time of the shooting?
- How did a man matching the description of Dukes' passenger turn up on a video taken minutes after the shooting showing how a bullet had gone through his baggy shorts if he wasn't chasing Kibble — or at least reasonably close to him?
- But the biggest question of all is: How can the Columbus Police Department turn a victim of circumstances like David Kibble into a prisoner for a crime that all the evidence it gathered other than a self-serving statement by one police officer indicated did not even occur?

David Kibble, meanwhile, is now Inmate A485895 at the Pick-away Correctional Institution, where he says he is living a nightmare come true. “I didn't do anything wrong that night and I ended up getting shot three times and being sentenced to prison for a crime that didn't happen,” Kibble says. Kibble says he immediately regretted accepting the plea bargain after he entered his Alford plea and was taken back to jail. Then he realized it would take longer to withdraw his plea — a motion that is rarely granted — before he would be released from prison.

Kibble will have to start over from scratch then. He has lost almost everything he owned, including his car, as well as his girlfriend. And he now will have a first-degree felony on his record — all, it would seem, after being shot and almost killed for a crime that never occurred.

“That's crazy,” Alan Dukes, one of the two men chasing David Kibble at the time of the shooting said when he was told of Kibble's conviction. “All he [Kibble] was trying to do was get away from us. I was shocked when I saw the officer start shooting for no reason. It didn't make any sense. That's why I took off. I was scared of what might happen next.”

Given what happened to David Kibble, Dukes may have made a wise decision.

Martin Yant is author of *Presumed Guilty: When Innocent People Are Wrongly Convicted* (Prometheus Books 1991). He is also an investigative journalist and legal investigator. He can be written at:

Martin Yant Investigations
1000 Urlin Ave. #1821
Columbus, Oh 43212
Email: martinyant@aol.com
Website: <http://www.truthinjustice.org/yant>



In Memoriam Fred Korematsu (1919-2005)

He Fought To Free 120,000 People Wrongly Imprisoned In The U.S.

By JD Staff

Fred Korematsu was living in San Leandro, California when a May 3, 1942 U.S. Army directive ordered him to leave his home and self-report within six days to a federal imprisonment facility. Since he had not been convicted, or even accused of committing any crime, he ignored the order. He went on living his life as if the order hadn't been issued. On May 30, 1942 he was charged with failing to obey the order to report to the prison facility and arrested. Represented pro bono by San Francisco attorney Wayne M. Collins, Mr. Korematsu's defense was that as a native-born American the order violated his right to due process of law. Although the facts of his case were that he had not been indicted, tried or convicted of any crime when his imprisonment was ordered, he was convicted in U.S. District Court and his conviction was affirmed by the federal Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In December 1944 the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed his conviction by a vote of six to three.

Thirty-seven years later a private researcher, historian Peter Irons, discovered internal government memos proving that federal lawyers and possibly other officials fabricated evidence relied upon by the federal courts to affirm Mr. Korematsu's conviction. Two years later, in November 1983, a federal judge in San Francisco vacated Mr. Korematsu's conviction. However the discovery of that exculpatory evidence was too late to affect the impact of the Supreme Court's 1944 decision: The Court's affirmation of Mr. Korematsu conviction depended on their endorsement of the legality of the order of May 3, 1942, that was authorized by President Franklin Roosevelt's February 1942 Executive Order 9066, 7 Fed. Reg. 1407. That Executive Order (9066) was relied on by the federal government to summarize, and as was proven decades later, wrongly imprison 120,000 U.S. residents of Japanese ancestry. Mr. Korematsu was a native-born American of Japanese descent.

What historian Irons found were misplaced and mislabeled records related to the federal government's strategy and legal briefs opposing Mr. Korematsu's appeal. U.S. Solicitor General Charles Fahy headed the government's legal team, and in one memo Justice Department lawyers accused Fahy of lying to the Supreme Court in his briefs and oral arguments. To justify Roosevelt's order as militarily necessary for the country's national security Fahy argued, for example, that Japanese-Americans on the West Coast were communicating with Japanese ships by “extensive radio signaling and in shore-to-ship signaling.” However it was known to government lawyers that the alleged “signaling” was actually the light of a flashlight used by people living near the coast to see the way to an outdoor toilet at night. The Justice Department contended in the internal memos that there were no known acts of treason (much less

Report Downplays Wrongful Convictions in U.S.

By Hans Sherrer

Exonerations in the United States: 1989 through 2003 is a report by University of Michigan staffers and law students. The report analyzed data from 328 cases during that 15 year period in which the defendant was officially declared, “not guilty of a crime for which he or she had previously been convicted.”

The report concentrates on rape and murder convictions,

widespread activities) by Japanese-Americans on the West Coast supporting the orders for their summary imprisonment.

Relying in part on the records Irons discovered, in 1983 a federal commission unanimously approved the conclusion that Roosevelt's imprisonment order was not based on any actual threat by Japanese-Americans to national security or justifiable as a military necessity. Rather, it was a response to “race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership.”

In 1988 federal legislation was approved authorizing \$20,000 in compensation to each surviving Japanese-American wrongly imprisoned as a consequence of Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066.

The Justice Department memos revealing that there was no factual basis for the wrongful imprisonment of 120,000 legally innocent Japanese-Americans would not have been written if Mr. Korematsu had meekly assented to the federal government's desire to indeterminately imprison him without so much as an accusation of criminal wrongdoing. So thanks to Mr. Korematsu's moral courage, more of the truth is known about that episode in U.S. history than if he had kowtowed to the order for his summary imprisonment for the non-crime of having Japanese ancestors. The treatment he declined to accept was described by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Murphy in another case as bearing “... a melancholy resemblance to the treatment accorded to members of the Jewish race in Germany and in other parts of Europe.” *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U.S. 81, 63 S. Ct. 1375, 1389, 1390. (J. Murphy concurring)

In April 2004 Mr. Korematsu once again stood up for the wrongly imprisoned. He filed a friend-of-the-court brief with the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of the many hundreds of people indeterminately imprisoned at the Guantánamo Bay Naval Station in Cuba without being charged with any crime. The federal government mimicked its position in his case sixty years earlier, by contending that the military necessity of protecting the nation's security justified indeterminately imprisoning uncharged people without having their case reviewed in federal court. Mr. Korematsu's brief stated in part, “The extreme nature of the government's position is all too familiar.” However unlike his case, in June 2004 the Supreme Court ruled that the people from dozens of countries imprisoned at Guantánamo Bay were entitled to a legal review of their case that could possibly result in their release. See, *Rasul v. Bush*, 124 S.Ct. 2686 (U.S. 06/28/2004). That is particularly important because international human rights organizations have estimated that upwards of 90% of the people imprisoned by the federal government as alleged “terrorists” since September 11, 2001 are innocent of any wrongdoing. Those people were swept into a state of indeterminate imprisonment due to simply being of a disfavored ethnicity or being in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Fred Korematsu died of respiratory failure on March 29, 2005. He was 86 years old.

Source: Internment foe finally won: Fred Korematsu fought relocation of Japanese Americans, Claudia Luther (Obituary writer, Los Angeles Times), The Seattle Times, April 3, 2005, News A23.
Korematsu v. U.S., 140 F2d 289 (9th Cir. 12/02/1943)
Korematsu v. U.S., 323 U.S. 214 (12/18/1944)



since 319 of the 328 cases studied involved a defendant convicted of one or both those crimes. One of two areas the researchers focused on, was how often several factors known to contribute to a wrongful conviction - eyewitness misidentification, perjury and a false confession - were present in those cases. It was found that 64% of the people exonerated of rape and/or murder had been misidentified, 15% had falsely confessed, and a prosecution witness had committed perjury in 44% of the cases.

The other area reported on is how race relates to exonerations. It was found that people of various races are exonerated at about the same rate as they are convicted — unless the person was under 18 at the time of arrest. Almost eight

Report continued on page 25