

From: VolusiaExposed.Com <VolusiaExposed@cfl.rr.com>
To: "Barnett, Joanne" <BarnettJ@sao7.org>
Cc: lyk@sao7.org
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Public Record Request - Brady vs. Maryland (1963)
Date: Fri, 27 Jan 2012 13:42:18 -0500

Ms. Ly: (Joanne Barnett)

Allow us then to modify our PRR, in your January 23, 2012 letter to us (see attached), you stated -

"While we (State Attorney) of course comply with the requirements of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), that does not require that we keep such a list, nor do we keep such a list."

VolusiaExposed.Com assumes that you are an educated person. We further assume that the Office of the State Attorney does not rely on rumor or hearsay in making such a statement.

Therefore, we now modify and limit our PRR - requesting that your office provide two examples (you select them) in which the 7th State Attorney's office provided defense counsel a Brady disclosure.

We would prefer that the Brady disclosures center on the veracity of an intended law enforcement witness(es) for the prosecution. However, if your records at the 7th are not up to the same standards as other Florida State Attorney offices, feel free to just present two general examples of Brady disclosures by the 7th.

Interestingly, our initial intention was to merely post the 7th's Brady list, as have been done with other Florida SAs released Brady lists. However, since you now profess not to maintain such a list, and **IF** you can not simply provide two examples of Brady disclosures, in support of your statement, that the 7th complies with the requirement of Brady, our focus would shift on whether the 7th is committed to the requirements of Brady.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

VX
volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com

"Behavior which appears superficially correct but is intrinsically corrupt always irritates those who see below the surface." - James Bryant Conant