

No. 04-8990

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PAUL GREGORY HOUSE,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

RICKY BELL, Warder,  
*Respondent,*

---

On Writ Of Certiorari To  
The United States Court of Appeals  
For The Sixth Circuit

---

BRIEF FOR THE INNOCENCE PROJECT, INC.,  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
SUPPORTING PETITIONER

---

DAVID GOLDBERG  
*Counsel of Record*

PETER J. NEUFELD  
BARRY C. SCHECK  
NINA R. MORRISON  
Innocence Project, Inc.  
100 Fifth Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10011  
(212) 364-5350

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. Post-Conviction Cases in Which Objective Scientific Evidence Proves the Falsity of Critical “Facts” Relied Upon By the Jury at Trial Should be Accorded Great Weight in the <i>Schlup</i> Analysis, a Principle the <i>En Banc</i> Majority Failed to Grasp.....	4
A. Public Confidence in the Outcome.....	5
B. Impact on Other “Inculpatory” Evidence.....	9
C. On “Finality”: Memories May Fade, But DNA Does Not.....	16
II. This Court Must Ensure a Meaningful Federal Safeguard Against Wrongful Imprisonment and Execution for the Small but Critical Minority of Innocent Persons With Exculpatory DNA or Equally Compelling Post-Conviction Evidence, but to Whom Prosecutors and State Courts Unreasonably Deny Relief .....	19
III. Evidence of Fraud and Fabrication by the State’s Serology Expert at Trial, Recently Discovered by Amicus, Gives Still Further Weight to Petitioner’s Constitutional Claims.....	23

IV. This Court Should Resolve the Confusion in the Lower  
Courts Regarding the Constitution’s Ban on Execution  
and Imprisonment of the Innocent That Has Arisen in the  
Wake of *Herrera v. Collins*.....28

CONCLUSION.....30

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Alabama v. Banks</i> , 845 So.2d 9 (Ala.2002).....	20
<i>Arizona v. Youngblood</i> , 481 U.S. 51 (1989).....	10
<i>Boyde v. Brown</i> , 404 F.3d 1159 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).....	29
<i>Bousley v. United States</i> , 523 U.S. 614 (1998).....	6
<i>Bragg v. Norris</i> , 128 F.Supp.2d 587 (E.D. Ark. 2000)...	17,18
<i>Brecht v. Abrahamson</i> , 507 U.S. 619 (1993). n.4.....	9
<i>Brewer v. State</i> , 819 So.2d 1169 (Miss. 2002). n.14.....	19
<i>Conley v. United States</i> , 323 F.3d 7 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 2003).....	29
<i>Dretke v. Haley</i> , 541 U.S. 386 (2004).....	4
<i>Ex Parte Elizondo</i> , 947 S.W.2d 202 (Tex. Cr. App. 1996).....	29
<i>Godschalk v. Montgomery County Dist. Atty. 's Ofc.</i> , 177 F.Supp.2d 366 (E.D. Pa. 2001).....	1
<i>Harvey v. Horan</i> , 285 F.3d 298 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).....	1
<i>Herrera v. Collins</i> , 506 U.S. 390 (1993)..... <i>et. passim</i>	
<i>House v. Bell</i> , 386 F.3d 668 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004)..... <i>et. passim</i>	
<i>Hunt v. McDade</i> , 205 F.3d 1333 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).....	21
<i>LaFevers v. Gibson</i> , 238 F.3d 1263 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001).....	29
<i>Milone v. Camp</i> , 22 F.3d 693 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).....	29
<i>Mooney v. Holohan</i> , 294 U.S. 103 (1935).....	8
<i>Napue v. Illinois</i> , 360 U.S. 264 (1959).....	8
<i>Nickerson v. Roe</i> , 260 F.Supp.2d 875 (D.Cal. 2003).....	21
<i>Noel v. Norris</i> , 322 F.3d 500 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003).....	29

<i>People v. Jackson</i> , 283 N.W.2d 648 (Mich. App. 1979).....	20
<i>People v. Waters</i> , 328 Ill.App.3d 117 (2002).....	21
<i>Ponder v. Lampert</i> , 2004 U.S. Dist. (D. Or. 2004).....	29
<i>Reasonover v. Washington</i> , 60 F.Supp.2d 939 (E.D. Mo. 1999).....	18
<i>Schlup v. Delo</i> , 513 U.S. 298 (1995)..... <i>et. passim</i>	
<i>Sibley v. Culliver</i> , 377 F.3d 1196 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).....	29
<i>State ex rel Amrine</i> , 102 S.W.3d 541 (MO 2003).....	29
<i>State v. Behn</i> , 868 A.2d 329 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 2005).....	20
<i>State v. Caldwell</i> , 322 N.W.2d 574 (Minn. 1982).....	20
<i>State v. Pope</i> , 80 P.2d 1232 (Mont. 2003).....	21
<i>State v. Youngblood</i> , 790 P.2d 759 (Ariz.App.1989).....	10
<i>Tehan v. United States</i> , 382 U.S. 406 (1966).....	7
<i>United States v. Agurs</i> , 427 U.S. 97 (1976).....	8
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> , 473 U.S. 677 (1985).....	8
<i>United States v. Mechanik et. al.</i> , 475 U.S. 66 (1986).....	16
<i>United States v. Nobles</i> , 422 U.S. 225 (1975).....	30
<i>Watkins v. Miller</i> , 92 F.Supp.2d 824 (D.Ind. 2000).....	21
<i>Williams v. United States</i> , 401 U.S. 646 (1971).....	7,8
<i>Williamson v. Reynolds</i> , 904 F.Supp. 1529 (E.D. Okla. 1995) n.9.....	13
<i>Williamson v. Ward</i> , 110 F.3d 1508 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) n.9.....	13

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Adam Liptak, *Prosecutors Fight DNA Use for Exoneration*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 29, 2003, at A1. n.15.....22

Barry Scheck, Peter Neufeld, and Jim Dwyer, ACTUAL INNOCENCE: WHEN JUSTICE GOES WRONG AND HOW TO MAKE IT RIGHT, (New American Library ed., Dec. 2003)..*et. passim*

C. Michael Bowers, *The Scientific Status of Bitemark Comparisons*, in MODERN SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE AND THE LAW, 541 (ed. David Faigman, et al., 2005). n.10.....13

Carl Hiaasen, *Still Behind Bars, Despite DNA Evidence*, THE MIAMI HERALD, May 9, 2004, at 1L. n.15.....22

Charles T. Jones, *DNA Tests Clear Two Men in Prison Escapee Sought in Slaying of Waitress*, DAILY OKLAHOMAN, April 16, 1999, at 1. n.8.....12

Convicted by Juries, Exonerated by Science: Case Studies in the Use of DNA Evidence to Establish Innocence After Trial, NAT'L INSTIT. JUST., U.S. Dept. Just., NCJ161258 (June 1996). n.7.....12

David L. Teibel, *Man Gets 24 years in '83 Child-Sex Case*, TUSCON CITIZEN, Aug. 20, 2002, at 5C. n.5.....11

Editorial, *Innocence Lost*, ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, Aug. 22, 2004, at 2P. n.16.....23

Flynn McRoberts & Steve Mills, *Forensics Under the Microscope: Testimony on Bite Marks Prone to Error*, CHIC. TRIB., Oct. 19, 2004, at C1. n.10.....13