



HADDON
MORGAN
FOREMAN

Haddon, Morgan and Foreman, p.c.
Harold A. Haddon

150 East 10th Avenue

DATE FILED: October 21, 2013 12:31 PM
FILING ID: 6786892303
CASE NUMBER: 2013CV31393

October 20, 2013

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Stanley L. Garnett, Esq.
District Attorney, Twentieth Judicial District
Boulder County Justice Center
1777 Sixth Street
Boulder, CO 80302
sgarnett@bouldercounty.org

Re: Order to Show Cause/*Brennan v. Garnett*, Case No. 2013 CV 31393

Dear Mr. Garnett:

As you know, this office represents John Ramsey. Our representation began in 1996. I have just reviewed the District Court order dated October 17, 2013 in the above-referenced case. It directs you to show cause why you should not be required to disclose to the media an apparent indictment voted by the Boulder County Grand Jury in 1999 but never prosecuted because it lacked sufficient evidence. I am writing this letter on behalf of John Ramsey.

John Ramsey has not been contacted by your office with respect to this matter and received no notice or opportunity to be heard. John and Patricia Ramsey were formally exonerated by the District Attorney's Office of the Twentieth Judicial District by letter dated July 9, 2008. A copy of that letter is attached for your reference. It was written after new DNA technology confirmed the existence of the perpetrator's DNA on Jon Benet Ramsey's clothing: the letter states that "there is no innocent explanation for its [the DNA's] incriminating presence . . ."

Based on this DNA exoneration, the letter also makes two statements which are highly relevant to the present litigation brought by the media:

- "No innocent person should have to endure such an extensive trial in the court of public opinion, especially when public officials have not had sufficient evidence to initiate a trial in a court of law." (p. 2)

Stanley L. Garnett, Esq.
October 20, 2013
Page 2


- “We [the District Attorney’s Office] intend in the future to treat you as the victims of this crime . . .”

As a matter of constitutional right (Colorado Constitution, Article II, Section 16a) and simple fairness, John Ramsey’s views should be considered. Public release of the allegations of an unprosecuted indictment only serves to further defame him and his late wife Patricia Ramsey. Mr. Ramsey will have no access to whatever evidence the prosecutors presented to the grand jury and will have no ability to disprove these allegations in a court of law. Nor will the public will have any ability to evaluate the propriety of the indictment unless the entire grand jury record is unsealed and opened to public view. The District Court found “transparency” to be the determinative factor in its Order to Show Cause. “Transparency” can only be accomplished if the entire record is made public.

It is therefore John Ramsey’s respectful request that you advise the District Court in response to its Order to Show Cause that if the unprosecuted indictment is to be publicly released, the Court should also order release of the entire grand jury record, including all witness testimony, all exhibits, all colloquy discussions between prosecutors and the grand jury and all drafts of potential indictments presented by the prosecutors to the grand jury.

I would also request that you provide the District Court, for its consideration, a copy of the District Attorney’s letter of July 9, 2008 which I have referenced and attached.

Sincerely,



Harold A. Haddon
G. Bryan Morgan

Attorneys for John Ramsey

HAH/sh

cc: Sean P. Finn, Esq. (w/enclosure to sefinn@bouldercounty.org)



DISTRICT ATTORNEY S OFFICE
TWENTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

MARY T. LACY, DISTRICT ATTORNEY

July 9, 2008

Mr. John Ramsey

Dear Mr. Ramsey,

As you are aware, since December 2002, the Boulder District Attorney's Office has been the agency responsible for the investigation of the homicide of your daughter, JonBenet. I understand that the fact that we have not been able to identify the person who killed her is a great disappointment that is a continuing hardship for you and your family.

However, significant new evidence has recently been discovered through the application of relatively new methods of DNA analysis. This new scientific evidence convinces us that it is appropriate, given the circumstances of this case, to state that we do not consider your immediate family, including you, your wife, Patsy, and your son, Burke, to be under any suspicion in the commission of this crime. I wish we could have done so before Mrs. Ramsey died.

We became aware last summer that some private laboratories were conducting a new methodology described as "touch DNA." One method of sampling for touch DNA is the "scraping method." This is a process in which forensic scientists scrape places where there are no stains or other signs of the possible presence of DNA to recover for analysis any genetic material that might nonetheless be present. We contracted with the Bode Technology Group, a highly reputable laboratory recommended to us by several law enforcement agencies, to use the scraping method for touch DNA on the long johns that JonBenet wore and that were probably handled by the perpetrator during the course of this crime.

The Bode Technology laboratory was able to develop a profile from DNA recovered from the two sides of the long johns. The previously identified profile from the crotch

of the underwear worn by JonBenet at the time of the murder matched the DNA recovered from the long johns at Bode.

Unexplained DNA on the victim of a crime is powerful evidence. The match of male DNA on two separate items of clothing worn by the victim at the time of the murder makes it clear to us that an unknown male handled these items. Despite substantial efforts over the years to identify the source of this DNA, there is no innocent explanation for its incriminating presence at three sites on these two different items of clothing that JonBenet was wearing at the time of her murder.

Solving this crime remains our goal, and its ultimate resolution will depend on more than just matching DNA. However, given the history of the publicity surrounding this case, I believe it is important and appropriate to provide you with our opinion that your family was not responsible for this crime. Based on the DNA results and our serious consideration of all the other evidence, we are comfortable that the profile now in CODIS is the profile of the perpetrator of this murder.

To the extent that we may have contributed in any way to the public perception that you might have been involved in this crime, I am deeply sorry. No innocent person should have to endure such an extensive trial in the court of public opinion, especially when public officials have not had sufficient evidence to initiate a trial in a court of law. I have the greatest respect for the way you and your family have handled this adversity.

I am aware that there will be those who will choose to continue to differ with our conclusion. But DNA is very often the most reliable forensic evidence we can hope to find and we rely on it often to bring to justice those who have committed crimes. I am very comfortable that our conclusion that this evidence has vindicated your family is based firmly on all of the evidence, including the reliable forensic DNA evidence that has been developed as a result of advances in that scientific field during this investigation.

We intend in the future to treat you as the victims of this crime, with the sympathy due you because of the horrific loss you suffered. Otherwise, we will continue to refrain from publicly discussing the evidence in this case.

We hope that we will one day obtain a DNA match from the CODIS data bank that will lead to further evidence and to the solution of this crime. With recent legislative changes throughout the country, the number of profiles available for comparison in the CODIS data bank is growing steadily. Law enforcement agencies are receiving increasing numbers of cold hits on DNA profiles that have been in the system for many years. We hope that one day soon we will get a match to this perpetrator. We will, of course, contact you immediately. Perhaps only then will we begin to understand the psychopathy or motivation for this brutal and senseless crime.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mary T. Lacy". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Mary T. Lacy
District Attorney
Twentieth Judicial District
Boulder, Colorado