

Dookhan cont. from page 4

issued, a letter was submitted to Justice Gaziano by Attorney Miriam Conrad [that stated](#):

“I am the Federal Public Defender for the Districts of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. My office represents indigent defendants charged with crimes in federal court. I write to request a copy of the list of defendants against whom charges were ordered dismissed by the Court on April 19, 2017, as well as any other lists the Court deems appropriate for my office to receive.”

Justice Gaziano has not yet responded to Conrad’s request.

No information has been publicly disclosed about how many years the 21,587 defendants cumulatively spent wrongly imprisoned and/or on probation or parole.

[Click here to read the SJC’s January 18, 2017 ruling in Kevin Bridgeman & Others v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District & Others](#), 476 Mass. 298 (1-18-2017)

Investigation of Hinton Lab by the Massachusetts OIG

On November 5, 2012 Governor Patrick requested that the Massachusetts Office of the Inspector General (“OIG”) investigate the Hinton Lab, that he had ordered shut down from drug testing on August 30, 2012. The OIG’s report was released on March 4, 2014. [Key conclusions](#) were:

- Dookhan was the sole bad actor at the Drug Lab.
- Management failures of lab directors contributed to Dookhan’s ability to commit her acts of malfeasance.
- Department of Public Health (“DPH”) Commissioner John Auerbach and his staff failed to respond appropriately to the report of Dookhan’s breach of protocol.
- The Drug Lab lacked formal and uniform protocols with respect to many of its basic operations, including training, chain of custody and testing methods.
- The training of chemists at the Drug Lab was wholly inadequate.
- The Drug Lab failed to provide potentially exculpatory evidence to the parties in criminal cases by not disclosing information about additional, inconsistent testing results.
- The Drug Lab failed to uniformly and consistently use a valid statistical ap-

proach to estimate the weight of drugs in certain drug trafficking cases.

- The quality control system in place at the Drug Lab was ineffective in detecting malfeasance, incompetence and inaccurate results.
- The security at the Drug Lab was insufficient in that management failed to appreciate the vulnerability of the drug safe, and did not do enough to protect its contents.
- There were no mechanisms in place to document discrepancies in chain-of-custody protocols or inconsistent testing results.

The report made a number of recommendations that it suggested could improve the quality control of drug handling and testing.

[Click here to read the OIG’s March 4, 2014 report](#) on the Investigation of the Drug Laboratory at the William A. Hinton State Laboratory Institute 2002–2012.

The Massachusetts legislature has appropriated \$30 million for expenses related to the Dookhan scandal. However, wrongful imprisonment compensation lawsuits could significantly increase that amount.

Sources:

[Kevin Bridgeman & Others v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District & Others](#), 476 Mass. 298 (1-18-2017)

[Supreme Judicial Court Dismisses](#) Over 21,000 Cases Affected by the Breach at the Hinton State Laboratory Institute, Press Release, Massachusetts Court System, April 20, 2017

[Kevin Bridgeman et al v. Dist. Attorney for the Suffolk Dist. et al](#), No. sj-2017-m0008 (Mass. Supreme Judicial Court) - Special-Master-Report

[Bridgeman v. Dist. Att. for the Suffolk Dist.](#), 471 Mass. 465, 30 N.E.3d 806 (Mass. Supreme Judicial Ct., 5-18-2015)

[Kevin Bridgeman & Others v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District & Others](#), No. SJ-2014-0005 (Mass. Supreme Judicial Ct.) Docket (Entry 204: Declaratory Judgment ordering dismissal of 21,587 cases; and, Entry 208: Letter from Federal Public Defender Atty. Miriam Conrad requesting district attorneys letters identifying the 21,587 people whose convictions were vacated and their cases dismissed.)

[“Bail set at \\$10,000 after arraignment](#) of Annie Dookhan, chemist in state drug lab scandal,” *The Boston Globe*, September 28, 2012.

[Annie Dookhan, former state chemist](#) who mishandled drug evidence, sentenced to 3 to 5 years in prison, *Boston Globe*, November 22, 2013

[Commonwealth v. Scott](#), 467 Mass. 336 (Mass. Supreme Judicial Court 2014)

[Investigation of the Drug Laboratory](#) at the William A. Hinton State Laboratory Institute 2002–2012, Massachusetts’ Office of the Inspector General, March 4, 2014

[Husband of Former Mass. Chemist](#) Reportedly Tried to Warn Prosecutor, *NECN*, Sept. 28, 2012

[Corrupt crime lab chemist](#) faces light sentence after ruining countless lives with falsified evidence, *PoliceStateUSA.com*, November 25, 2013

Annie Dookhan’s Eight Year Rampage Of Faking Scientific Evidence To Convict Innocent People Was Aided By The Legal System

Justice Denied Editorial

Annie Dookhan’s saga of sabotaging more than twenty-one thousand criminal cases in Massachusetts during the eight years she “worked” as a chemist in the Hinton State Laboratory is chronicled in [Justice Denied’s article](#), “21,587 People Exonerated In Massachusetts Due To Fraudulent Crime Lab Testing” (May 6, 2017).

From her hiring in 2003 to her suspension in June 2011, Dookhan provided critical prosecution evidence by falsely certifying a suspected substance was an illegal drug. She was praised for her productivity and assistance to prosecutors during the years she was fabricating evidence by taking short-cuts and faking tests.

21,587 convictions in seven Massachusetts counties that depended on Dookhan’s “drug certification” [were vacated](#) and the charges dismissed, on April 19, 2017 by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court.

Justice Denied’s article is the only known reporting about the Dookhan saga that makes the obvious observation she did not act alone: she was a cog in the law enforcement machine who was directly and indirectly assisted in her nefarious and illegal activities by hundreds, and possibly more than a thousand people. The success of her almost decade long subterfuge required willful blindness by a very large number of people intimately involved in Massachusetts’ legal system: judges; prosecutors; defense lawyers; lab supervisors and technicians; and others.

It was only someone outside the legal system -- her husband -- who tried to alert authorities about Dookhan’s dishonesty. However, his whistleblower warnings to the Norfolk County DA were ignored.

Given how deeply imbedded she was in the legal system, it isn’t surprising that Dookhan’s criminal career was only accidentally derailed: A lone person in the Hin-

Dookhan Editorial on p. 6

