

State's Attachment 1

RECEIVED
**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND**

ADNAN SYED,
Petitioner,

*

*

v.

Petition No. 10432

*

Original Case Nos. 199103042-46

STATE OF MARYLAND,
Respondent

*

* * * * *

**SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO RE-OPEN
POST-CONVICTION PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner Adnan Syed, by and through counsel, C. Justin Brown, hereby supplements his Motion to Re-Open Post-Conviction Proceedings to include proof that the cell tower evidence used against him was unreliable and should have been excluded from trial. Pursuant to Md. Code, Crim. Pro., § 7-104, it is in the interest of justice that the Court consider this proof, and issues associated with it.

The information Syed presents here is based on the State's contention – at trial, at the post-conviction hearing and on appeal – that cellular tower evidence, specifically two incoming phone calls, put Syed at the site where the victim was buried on the evening of her disappearance. The State has held this up as being its most reliable evidence against Syed.

It is now known, however, that when AT&T provided the cellular tower data to the State, AT&T explicitly warned the State that: "Outgoing calls only are reliable for location status. Any incoming calls will NOT be considered reliable information for location." Ex. 1 (Feb. 22, 1999, fax sent from Rose Ricciardi of AT&T to Det. Bill Ritz

of Baltimore City Police Department) (emphasis in original). Despite this unambiguous warning, the State presented at trial evidence of incoming calls to determine location and used this to convict Syed. The State then relied on this supposed proof in arguments to the Post-Conviction Court, T. 10/25/12 at 115–16,¹ and to the Court of Special Appeals, Brief of Appellee at 8–9.²

It is in the interest of justice that Syed be able to challenge this evidence because it is inextricably linked to the timeline Syed establishes with his alibi defense. If the State has argued that alibi evidence is undermined by the cell tower evidence, as it has, then Syed must be able to attack the cell tower evidence.

In addition, the State's misuse of cell tower location, and trial counsel's failure to do anything about it, amounts to separate claims of ineffective assistance of counsel, prosecutorial misconduct, and a denial of Syed's due process – claims that Syed raises with this filing.³

It would be a miscarriage of justice, furthermore, to allow Syed's conviction to stand when this evidence was used to obtain the conviction.

¹ Citations to the trial or post-conviction transcript are referred to as "T.", followed by the date of the testimony and the page number.

² All of the appellate filings in this case are posted on the Court of Special Appeals' website at: <http://mdcourts.gov/media/index.html>.

³ To the extent that the State may argue waiver or other procedural bar, Syed reserves the right to supplement in response thereto.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Syed's case has taken a circuitous route through the Maryland courts. His first trial, in 1999, ended in a mistrial after a juror overheard the trial judge refer to defense counsel, Cristina Gutierrez, as a liar. He was convicted after the second trial, and sentenced on June 26, 2000, to life plus 30 years in prison.

Syed appealed to the Court of Special Appeals, but his conviction was affirmed. He filed a timely post-conviction petition in 2010, and hearings were conducted at the Circuit Court in 2012.

The original Post-Conviction Petition centered on an alibi witness named Asia McClain. Syed presented evidence that McClain remembered being with Syed in a public library at the time when, according to the State, the murder took place. Syed also established that this information was conveyed to Gutierrez – as proven by references to McClain found in Gutierrez' notes. Finally, Syed established that McClain was willing to testify at trial in Syed's defense, but that nobody from the defense team ever contacted her to hear her story. For reasons that did not become evident until later, McClain did not testify at the post-conviction hearing.

On December 30, 2013, the Circuit Court issued an opinion denying the post-conviction petition. In essence, the Circuit Court concluded that Gutierrez had made a calculated, strategic choice to not call McClain as an alibi witness.

Syed filed an Application for Leave to Appeal the denial of the post-conviction ("ALA"). He supplemented the ALA when new information emerged showing why McClain never testified at the post-conviction hearing: McClain stated that, among other

things, the State prosecutor, Kevin Urick, spoke to her on the phone before the hearing and discouraged her from participating.⁴

The Court of Special Appeals granted the ALA on February 6, 2015, and ordered formal briefing in anticipation of oral arguments. After Syed and the State each filed opening briefs, however, the Court of Special Appeals issued an Order remanding the case to the Circuit Court, so that Syed could file a motion to re-open post-conviction proceedings related to the issues raised on appeal.

Syed filed his Motion to Re-Open Post-Conviction on June 30, 2015. As of August 12, 2015, the State had not responded to Syed's Motion. The Court then contacted the State and inquired whether it wished to respond; the State said it did. The Court gave the State until September 8, 2015, to do so.

Syed now seeks to introduce at a re-opened post-conviction proceeding evidence and issues related to the cellular tower evidence, which was used at trial, at the original post-conviction proceeding, and in appellate filings. Syed is filing this Motion in good faith and as soon as possible following the very recent discovery and vetting of this cellular tower information.

II. RELEVANT FACTS

Syed is currently serving a life sentence for the murder of Hae Min Lee, a Woodlawn High School student who went missing on January 13, 1999.

⁴ McClain also stated that Urick testified falsely at the post-conviction hearing when he claimed McClain told him she had written an alibi affidavit only because she was pressured by Syed's family.

The State obtained a conviction against Syed in large part based on two types of evidence. First, the State relied on the testimony of Jay Wilds, a cooperating witness and drug dealer who told multiple inconsistent versions of events, and who later admitted publically that he had made up parts of his trial testimony against Syed. Wilds claimed that, although he did not witness the murder, he was with Syed on the evening of January 13, 1999, when Syed allegedly buried Lee's body in Leakin Park.

The State also relied upon cellular tower evidence – a nascent technology at the time – to corroborate Wilds' story and to try to track Syed's cellular phone on the day and night in question. The most critical element of this evidence was testimony by the State's expert, Abraham Waranowitz, that Syed's phone was close to Leakin Park when it received calls at 7:09 p.m. and 7:16 p.m. The State argued forcefully, at multiple stages of the proceedings, that this corroborated Wilds' story and put Syed at the site where the body was eventually discovered.

In closing arguments at trial, for example, the State argued:

The defense tells you well, they can't place you specifically within any place by this. Absolutely true, but look at 7:09 and 7:16, [cell tower] 689B, which is the Leakin Park coverage area. There's a witness who says they were in Leakin Park. If the cell coverage area comes back as that that includes Leakin Park, that is reasonable circumstantial evidence that you can use to say they were in Leakin Park.

T. 2/25/00 at 125.

Again, at the post-conviction hearing, the State touted the value of the cell tower location evidence and argued that, even if Syed could establish the Asia McClain alibi, “[i]t wouldn't explain why he's in Leakin Park with Jay Wilds at 7:00 on the night that

Hae Min Lee is murdered. That is the strength of this case.” T. 10/25/12 at 115.

Essentially, the State was arguing that, even if Gutierrez rendered deficient performance under *Strickland v. Washington* by not contacting the alibi witness, Syed could not prove that this prejudiced his defense. Why? Because the State still had cell tower evidence.

The evidence Syed now presents to the Court, however, shows that the cell tower evidence was misleading and it should have never been admitted at trial. *See* Ex. 2 (Grant Affidavit). It was presented to the Jury and to multiple courts as the pillar of the State’s case. Meanwhile, AT&T, the telephone company responsible for the cellular network, had explicitly written to the State prior to trial and explained that the information was “NOT to be considered reliable information for location.” Ex. 1.

Despite being aware of this information – or at least having constructive knowledge of it – the State introduced the evidence at trial and later held it up as being its strongest evidence.

Gutierrez, meanwhile, had received the information, but failed to act on it in any way. She failed to hire an expert to interpret it; she failed to exclude it through a *Frye-Reed* hearing; she failed to cross examine the State’s expert about it; and she failed to present the evidence to the Jury. There is no imaginable way this could have been a strategic choice.

It was human error.

III. LEGAL ARGUMENT

It is in the interest of justice that the Court allow Syed to present factual information, expert testimony and claims related to cellular tower evidence in a re-

opened post-conviction proceeding. It makes eminent sense to consider the issue now, in relation to the alibi issue, rather than force Syed to re-raise the issue in a successive motion to re-open post-conviction, should he be unsuccessful in this effort.

The Maryland Code sets forth a concise standard for the re-opening of a post-conviction proceeding: “The court may reopen a postconviction proceeding that was previously concluded if the court determines that the action is in the interests of justice.” Md. Code, Crim. Pro., § 7-104. There is no time limit restricting when a petitioner may file a motion to re-open post-conviction proceedings.

It is in the interest of justice that this Court seek the truth and consider all relevant evidence in determining whether Adnan Syed spends the rest of his life in prison. While finality of convictions is a legitimate concern for the Court, it is not a greater concern than the search for truth.

a. Procedural reasons for allowing the cellular tower issue

Although Syed is presenting this issue late in the proceedings,⁵ it is an issue significant enough that the Court should hear it before rendering a ruling.

First, as a matter of judicial economy, the Court should consider this issue now. If it does not, and if Syed’s conviction is not vacated on the alibi issue, Syed would have to raise the issue in a successive motion to re-open post-conviction proceedings. Not only could this lead to another separate proceeding, but it could lead to another appeal. It is in

⁵ Upon becoming aware of this issue, counsel has moved expeditiously to verify the merits of the issue with a cellular tower expert, and to file this supplement as soon as possible.

the interest of all parties to resolve this matter – and get to the heart of the problem – once and for all. Now is the time to do so.

Second, and most importantly, the cell tower arguments presented here relate to the alibi issue, and for that reason they should be considered in concert with the alibi issue. As the Court is well aware, the alibi issue is a *Strickland* claim, meaning Syed has the burden to prove deficient performance and prejudice.

Proof of prejudice, as the State has pointed out in its arguments and filings, requires an inquiry into the strength of the State's case. The State has constantly argued that its case is strong enough that, even if Gutierrez had presented the alibi witness, the trial still would have resulted in a guilty verdict. This was argued at the post-conviction hearing and in the State's brief filed in the Court of Special Appeals.

At the post-conviction hearing, for example, the State argued that: "Even if the Defendant had managed to account for some alibi at that particular point in time, there's been no showings to what affect that would have in light of the other evidence. It wouldn't explain why he's in Leakin Park with Jay Wilds at 7:00 on the night that Hae Min Lee is murdered. That is the strength of the State's evidence in this case." T. 10/25/12 at 115.

In its appellate brief, moreover, the State argues – for the first time – that Syed's alibi issue fails because the State could have relied on a different timeline, which would have rendered Asia McClain's testimony less potent. In its brief the State argues that the murder could have taken place around a 3:15 p.m. phone call on January 13, 1999, rather

than around a 2:36 p.m. phone call (which was argued at trial). Brief of Appellee at 31–32, n.9.

Now that the State is presenting this argument to the Court of Special Appeals, the nature and reliability of these calls is highly relevant. The 3:15 p.m. call was an incoming call that activated a cell tower site near where the State argues the murder took place (the Best Buy parking lot). If the State is now using these phone records to defend against the Asia McClain alibi, the records, and their reliability, is squarely in play and should be considered by this Court.

The calls are also relevant on a more global level. In the proceeding now before this Court, the credibility of Asia McClain is pitted against the credibility of Jay Wilds. The State argues, time and time again, that Jay Wilds' story is corroborated by the cellular tower evidence. That, the State argues, gives credence to otherwise inconsistent cooperator testimony put forth by Wilds. It follows that, if Syed is to be given a fair chance to prove that Asia McClain is more credible than Jay Wilds, Syed must be allowed to attack the corroboration that props up Wilds' testimony.

Lest there be any doubt about the interrelatedness of these issues, the State's lead trial attorney, Kevin Urick, has offered his assessment. In his comments to "The Intercept," Urick stated the following:

Question: Do you have any doubts about the outcome of the trial?

Kevin Urick: No. The reason is: once you understood the cellphone records—that killed any alibi defense that Syed had. I think when you take that in conjunction with Jay's testimony, it became a very strong case.

Urick went on to describe how he would have cross-examined Syed, if given the opportunity:

Kevin Urick: And my very last question would be: What is your explanation for why you either received or made a call from Leakin Park the evening that Hae Min Lee disappeared, the very park that her body was found in five weeks later? I think that was the stumbling block for the defense. They have no explanation for that.

Ex. 3, Natasha Vargas-Cooper & Ken Silverstein, *Exclusive: Prosecutor in 'Serial' Case Goes on the Record*, THE INTERCEPT, (Jan. 7, 2015),

<https://firstlook.org/theintercept/2015/01/07/prosecutor-serial-case-goes-record/>.

Considering the interrelatedness of issues now before the Court, especially under the *Strickland* prejudice prong, and the interests of judicial fairness and economy, the cellular tower evidence and related issues should be considered by this Court at a re-opened post-conviction proceeding.

b. Substantive reasons for hearing additional cellular tower evidence

The information Syed sets forth in this Motion is material to the integrity of the case – and it helps prove Syed’s claim of innocence. If Gutierrez had been aware of the document from AT&T – which was turned over to her in discovery – and if she had acted upon it, it is almost certain that the State would have been precluded from introducing at trial cell tower location evidence based on incoming telephone calls. Without this evidence, and other questionable cell tower evidence, the State’s case would have been severely weakened and there is a reasonable probability that Syed would not have been convicted.

Location evidence generated by the incoming phone calls would not have been admissible because it would not have met the *Frye-Reed* standard, which requires general acceptance of reliability in the relevant scientific community. *Reed v. State*, 283 Md. 374, 382 (1978) (adopting standard from *Frye v United States*, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923)).

A *Frye-Reed* hearing here would have been a one-sided affair. If AT&T, the architect and operator of the cell tower network, did not think incoming calls were “reliable information for location,” Ex. 1, it is unfathomable that a Baltimore City Circuit Court judge would have allowed an expert opinion under *Frye-Reed* based on this method.⁶

Not only was the location method flawed with regard to incoming phone calls, but the State misused the cell tower information in other ways. For example, the State argued that a 5:14 p.m. incoming call was proof that Syed checked his voicemail at that time. T. 1/27/00 at 108; T. 2/25/00 at 67. This was potentially harmful to the defense because Syed ordinarily would have been at track practice at this time. However, the fax from AT&T, Ex. 1, coupled with another phone record provided to the defense, Ex. 4, shows that this call was in fact an incoming call in which the caller was leaving a voice message on Syed’s phone. Thus, the call certainly could have occurred while Syed was at track practice (and presumably was not holding his phone).

⁶ The ability of experts to use cell tower data to track phones has changed just as technology has changed. While in 1999 AT&T considered the use of incoming calls to be unreliable, *see* Ex. 1, today’s technology may have changed to the point where it is less unreliable.

These factual and analytic errors are so egregious that, if properly raised at trial by Gutierrez, much of, if not all of, the cellular evidence would have been rendered inadmissible.

The issue Syed raises here with cellular tower evidence related to incoming phone calls is similar to the issue raised in *Kulbicki v. State*, 440 Md. 33 (2014).⁷ The *Kulbicki* court found that trial counsel was constitutionally ineffective for not investigating and challenging the State's scientific evidence regarding comparative bullet lead analysis. *Id.* at 56. Specifically, the Court found that counsel was ineffective for not cross-examining the State's expert with a report he had authored a few years before his trial testimony – even though the science at issue was generally accepted at the time and would not be debunked until years later. *Id.* at 52–53; *see also Roberts v. Howton*, 13 F. Supp. 3d 1077, 1098 (D. Or. 2014) (finding ineffective assistance of counsel and reversing conviction when trial counsel failed to “adequately investigate or hire an expert to evaluate the cell tower evidence”).

The ineffective assistance of counsel claim presented here is far more persuasive than the claim in *Kulbicki*. As described above, Gutierrez had the AT&T fax in her file, and the document showed that the use of incoming cellular calls to determine location was unreliable. She simply failed to act on it.


⁷ *Kulbicki*'s ineffective assistance of counsel claim morphed over a 16-year period. The precise contours of the claim were not defined until the topic arose at oral arguments and the Court of Appeals *sua sponte* reframed and resuscitated the issue. *Id.* at 40.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons explained above, Syed respectfully requests that this Court re-open his post-conviction proceeding and allow him to raise not only the Asia McClain issue, but also information and issues related to cell tower location evidence.

In addition, Syed requests that he be allowed to supplement this filing with other relevant materials, if and when they become available. This is reasonable in consideration of the fact that counsel is filing this Motion in an expedited fashion to bring it to the Court's attention as soon as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,



C. Justin Brown


THE LAW OFFICE OF C. JUSTIN BROWN
231 East Baltimore Street, Suite 1102
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Tel: 410-244-5444
Fax: 410-934-3208

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 24th day of August, 2015, a copy of the foregoing was provided to the following:

Thiru Vignarajah
Office of the Attorney General
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202

Michael Schatzow
Office of the State's Attorney
120 E. Baltimore St.
Baltimore, MD 21202



C. Justin Brown

State's Attachment 2



Security Department

AT&T Wireless Services
801 Northpoint Parkway
West Palm Beach, FL 33407

FAX COVER SHEET

TO: Bill Ritz

FAX NUMBER: 410 396 2257

FROM: Rose Ricciardi

PHONE NUMBER: 800-635-6840

FAX NUMBER: (888) 938-4715

TOTAL PAGES (INCLUDING COVER): (10)

MESSAGE: _____

How to read "Subscriber Activity" Reports

Please note: All call times are recorded in Eastern Standard time.

Type codes are defined as the following:

- Int = Outgoing long distance call
- Lcl = Outgoing local call
- CFO = Call forwarding
- Sp = Special Feature
- Inc = Incoming Call

When "Sp" is noted in the "Type" column and then the "Dialed #" column shows "W" and the target phone number" for instance "#7182225555", this is an incoming call that was not answered and then forwarded to voice mail. The preceding row (which is an incoming call) will also indicate "CFO" in the "feature" column.

Outgoing calls only are reliable for location status. Any incoming calls will NOT be considered reliable information for location.

Blacked out areas on this report (if any) are cell site locations which need a court order signed by a judge in order for us to provide.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This report contains information of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may

32	410265522	01:17:21 PM	00:04:09	L651C
33	4109229704	01:15:27 PM	00:00:11	L651C
34	4102030522	12:30:29 PM	00:00:09	L651C

TOTAL USAGE: 00:40:54

Call Date: 01/13/1999

	Dialed No.	Call Time HR:MM:SC	Call Duration HR:MM:SC	Cell Site
1	4109449232	10:30:37 PM	00:01:44	L651C
2	4109699498	10:29:40 PM	00:00:18	L651C
3	4103407374	10:02:44 PM	00:00:06	L698B
4	3016030657	09:57:14 PM	00:00:24	L651C
5	4109229704	09:10:42 PM	00:08:41	L651C
6	4109229704	09:03:47 PM	00:05:28	L651C
7	3016030657	09:01:45 PM	00:01:24	L651C
8	4103900304	08:05:43 PM	00:00:13	L653C
9	4103900304	08:04:44 PM	00:00:32	L653A
10	incoming	07:16:22 PM	00:00:32	L609B
11	incoming	07:09:49 PM	00:00:33	L609B
12	4103900304	07:00:21 PM	00:00:23	L651A
13	4103407374	06:59:31 PM	00:00:27	L651A
14	incoming	06:24:37 PM	00:04:15	L608C
15	incoming	06:09:45 PM	00:00:53	L608C
16	incoming	06:07:09 PM	00:00:56	L655A
17	4109229704	05:38:24 PM	00:00:02	L653C
18	44432539023	05:14:07 PM	00:01:07	BLTN2
19	incoming	05:14:07 PM	00:01:07	WB443
20	incoming	04:58:54 PM	00:00:19	L654C
21	incoming	04:27:09 PM	00:02:56	L654C
22	4107442609	04:12:01 PM	00:00:28	L699A
23	4102314650	03:59:48 PM	00:00:25	L651A
24	13016950485	03:48:11 PM	00:01:25	L651A
25	3016030657	03:32:45 PM	00:02:22	L651C
26	4107442609	03:21:04 PM	00:00:42	L651C
27	incoming	03:15:04 PM	00:00:20	L651C
28	incoming	02:36:13 PM	00:00:05	L651B
29	incoming	12:43:38 PM	00:00:24	L652A
30	4107442609	12:41:04 PM	00:01:29	L652A
31	4107442609	12:07:30 PM	00:00:21	L688A
32	4107088495	10:45:29 AM	00:00:28	L651A
33	4106025744	12:35:18 AM	00:01:24	L654A
34	4106025744	12:01:22 AM	00:00:02	L602C

TOTAL USAGE: 00:42:15

Hi DEANNA,

HERE IS A LIST OF THE CALLS MADE BY THE SUSPECT ON 1-13-99. WHAT I'M HOPING TO ACCOMPLISH IS TO HAVE THE ENGINEER PREPARE A MAP OR DIAGRAM OF THE CALLS OUTGOING AND INCOMING FROM THE CELL SITE LOCATIONS. THIS WOULD AID & CORROBORATE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO US BY WITNESSES AND DISCREDIT THE SUSPECTS ALIBI.

PLEASE CALL ME AND ADVISE IF THIS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

THANKS

Bill

Call Date: 01/12/1999

	Dialed No.	Call Time HR:MM:SC	Call Duration HR:MM:SC	Cell Site
1	4106025244	11:27:13 PM	00:00:02	L608C
2	4109229704	11:07:36 PM	00:18:46	L651C
3	3016030657	11:05:57 PM	00:00:35	L651C
4	4109229704	09:41:35 PM	00:03:18	L651C
5	44432539023	09:32:36 PM	00:00:28	BLTN2
6	incoming	09:32:36 PM	00:00:28	WB443
7	4102030522	09:26:40 PM	00:03:51	L651C
8	incoming	09:24:33 PM	00:00:09	L651C
9	incoming	09:21:24 PM	00:00:15	L651C
10	4107088495	09:18:21 PM	00:00:18	L651C

023

ATTN: SECURITY

02/22/99 14:53 FAX 888 838 4715

State's Attachment 3



Baltimore Police Department

COMMUNITY POLICING

The move to excellence in the 1990's



KURT L. SCHMIDTKE
Mayor

THOMAS C. FRAZIER
Police Commissioner

F A C S I M I L E

To: SUBPOENA COMPLIANCE UNIT

Of: AT&T WIRELESS - ATT: DEANNA BACHE

Fax Number: 1-888-938-4715

From: DET. WILLIAM F RIZ

Phone Number: (410) 396-2100

Fax Number: (410) 396-2257

Pages (Including Cover): 4

Date: 2 MARCH 1999

Comments: HARD COPY WAS MAILED OUT
ON SATURDAY 2/27, ALSO IT
WAS FAXED. CHRIS CHECKED THIS
A.M. AND WAS UNABLE TO LOCATE IT.
THIS INFORMATION IS VITAL AND STILL
NEEDED IN THE INVESTIGATION.

This facsimile contains sensitive information necessary to conduct the official business of the Baltimore City Police Department and should not be disseminated to parties outside law enforcement channels. If received in error please destroy all pages and contact the sender immediately.

THANKS AGAIN,
 Det. William F. Riz

Criminal Investigation Bureau
 Homicide Unit

IN RE:

A

SPECIAL

INVESTIGATION

* * * *

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

IN THE

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

* * * *

SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM

DIRECTED TO:

AT & T WIRELESS
801 NORTH POINT PARKWAY
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33407

ATTENTION:

SUBPOENA COMPLAINT UNIT

Upon being advised by Detective William Ritz, a duly constituted member of the Baltimore City Police Department, that an investigation is currently being conducted into certain criminal violations in the City of Baltimore; and Upon being advised by said Detective that a review of certain records of AT & T Wireless is essential to the completion of said investigation.

You are therefore directed the 26th day of February 1999, to furnish any and all subscriber information and call history from January 1, 1999 to present in regards to the following number(s):

(410) 340-7374

Returnable immediately upon service to Vickie L. Wash, Assistant State's Attorney, Homicide Division, 111 North Calvert Street, Room 308 Courthouse East, Baltimore Maryland 21202, or Detective William Ritz, Baltimore City Police Department, Homicide Unit, Baltimore, Maryland 21202.

Vickie L. Wash
VICKIE L. WASH
ASSISTANT STATE'S ATTORNEY
HOMICIDE DIVISION

Shawn Brisley
FOREPERSON

You are further directed, in accordance with the secrecy of investigations before the Grand Jury, not to disclose the existence of this Subpoena Duces Tecum.

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE


I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the Subpoena Duces Tecum was personally served upon _____ in Baltimore, Maryland, State of Maryland, on this ____ day of _____, 1998; further

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am over eighteen (18) years of age.

TRUE COPY
TEST

[Handwritten signature]

2/26/99



32	4109229704	01:17:21 PM	00:04:09	L651C
33	4109229704	01:15:27 PM	00:00:11	L651C
34	4102030522	12:30:19 PM	00:00:09	L651C

TOTAL USAGE: 00:40:54

Call Date: 01/13/1999

	Dialed No.	Call Time HR:MN:SC	Call Duration HR:MN:SC	Cell Site
1	4109449232	10:30:37 PM	00:01:44	L651C
2	4108699498	10:29:40 PM	00:00:18	L651C
3	4103407374	10:02:44 PM	00:00:06	L698B
4	3016030657	09:57:14 PM	00:00:24	L651C
5	4109229704	09:10:42 PM	00:08:41	L651C
6	4109229704	09:03:47 PM	00:05:28	L651C
7	3016030657	09:01:46 PM	00:01:24	L651C
8	4103900384	08:05:43 PM	00:00:13	L653C
9	4103900384	08:04:44 PM	00:00:32	L653A
10	incoming	07:16:22 PM	00:00:32	L689B
11	incoming	07:09:49 PM	00:00:33	L689B
12	4103900384	07:00:21 PM	00:00:23	L651A
13	4103407374	06:59:31 PM	00:00:27	L651A
14	incoming	06:24:37 PM	00:04:15	L608C
15	incoming	06:09:45 PM	00:00:53	L608C
16	incoming	06:07:09 PM	00:00:56	L655A
17	4109229704	05:38:24 PM	00:00:02	L653C
18	44432539023	05:14:07 PM	00:01:07	BLTM2
19	incoming	05:14:07 PM	00:01:07	WB443
20	incoming	04:58:54 PM	00:00:19	L654C
21	incoming	04:27:09 PM	00:02:56	L654C
22	4107442609	04:12:01 PM	00:00:28	L689A
23	4102334650	03:59:48 PM	00:00:25	L651A
24	13016958485	03:48:11 PM	00:01:25	L651A
25	3016030657	03:32:45 PM	00:02:22	L651C
26	4107442609	03:21:04 PM	00:00:42	L651C
27	incoming	03:15:04 PM	00:00:20	L651C
28	incoming	02:36:13 PM	00:00:05	L651B
29	incoming	12:43:38 PM	00:00:24	L652A
30	4107442609	12:41:04 PM	00:01:29	L652A
31	4107442609	12:07:30 PM	00:00:21	L688A
32	4107088495	10:45:29 AM	00:00:28	L651A
33	4106025244	12:35:18 AM	00:01:24	L654A
34	4106025244	12:01:22 AM	00:00:02	L602C

TOTAL USAGE: 00:42:15

Call Date: 01/12/1999

	Dialed No.	Call Time HR:MN:SC	Call Duration HR:MN:SC	Cell Site
1	4106025244	11:27:13 PM	00:00:02	L608C
2	4109229704	11:07:36 PM	00:18:46	L651C
3	3016030657	11:05:57 PM	00:00:36	L651C
4	4109229704	09:41:35 PM	00:03:18	L651C
5	44432539023	09:32:36 PM	00:00:28	BLTM2
6	incoming	09:32:36 PM	00:00:28	WB443
7	4102030522	09:26:40 PM	00:03:51	L651C
8	incoming	09:24:33 PM	00:00:09	L651C
9	incoming	09:21:24 PM	00:00:15	L651C
10	4107888495	09:18:21 PM	00:00:18	L651C

Hi DEANNA,

HERE IS A LIST OF THE CALLS MADE BY THE SUSPECT ON 1-13-99. WHAT I'M HOPING TO ACCOMPLISH IS TO HAVE THE ENGINEER PREPARE A MAP OR DIAGRAM OF THE CALLS OUTGOING AND INCOMING FROM THE CELL SITE LOCATIONS. THIS WOULD AID IN CORROBORATE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO US BY WITNESSES AND DISCREDIT THE SUSPECTS ALIBI

PLEASE CALL ME AND ADVISE IF THIS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

THANKS
Bill

023

ATTWS-SECURITY

02/22/99 14:53 FAX 888 938 4715

ANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 03/02/1999 09:33
NAME :
FAX :
TEL :

DATE, TIME
FAX NO./NAME
DURATION
PAGE(S)
RESULT
MODE

03/02 09:31
918889384715
00:01:47
04
OK
STANDARD

File 7375

FAX COVER SHEET

TO: Det. William Kitz

FAX NUMBER: 410 396 2257

FROM: Deanna Backe

PHONE NUMBER: 800-635-6840

FAX NUMBER: (888) 938-4715

TOTAL PAGES (INCLUDING COVER): 20

MESSAGE: _____

How to read "Subscriber Activity" Reports

Please note: All call times are recorded in Eastern Standard time.

Type codes are defined as the following:

Int = Outgoing long distance call	Lcl = Outgoing local call
CFO = Call forwarding	Sp = Special Feature
Inc = Incoming Call	

When "Sp" is noted in the "Type" column and then the "Dialed #" column shows "# and the target phone number" for instance "#7182225555", this is an incoming call that was not answered and then forwarded to voice mail. The preceding row (which is an incoming call) will also indicate "CFO" in the "feature" column.

Outgoing calls only are reliable for location status. Any incoming calls will NOT be considered reliable information for location.

Blacked out areas on this report (if any) are cell site locations which need a court order signed by a judge in order for us to provide.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information contained in this transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which is addressed and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this transmission in error, and that any review, dissemination, retention or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for the return of the original communication to us. Thank you.

MESSAGE THIS IS THE LAST PAGE

KSM1031 TBH/W42W8

SERVICE DESCRIPTION

CHIS

PNE

02/17/99 10:02A

CMD ==>

ACCOUNT: 661245498

NAME: BILAL AHMED

CTL: 18YW

D TELEPHONE: 443 253 9023 LAST CHANGE 011199 BY QLP

STATUS: ACTIVE 011199 NC

EQUIPMENT:

PREVIOUS STATUS:

LAST SERVICE ORDER: mnielsen 011199

ORDER DATE: 011199

ELEC SERIAL NO: EBD22CD4 NOK B

STARTING START DATE: 011199.

MECH SERIAL NUM: 6160

BILL THRU DATE: 021899

FPF PIN:

DEALER CODE: E5304 E5304

CP:

RATE PLAN: AD1 011199

TAX ID: W02 011199

IEC: 0288 011199

SERVICE USER: Adrian M Syedd

PAPERWK ST:

DEPOSIT REQUIRED:

PAID:

HELD:

PROMOS: P27-A P24-A

ORIG CONTRACT DATE:

CONTRACT START DATE: 011199 CONTRACT LENGTH: 12

MODEL:

YR:

MESSAGE

NORTHEAST PCS

SUBSCRIBER ACTIVITY

Subscriber Number: 4432539023

Printed: Wed Feb 17 1999 11:08:12 AM

914103962257:# 3

2-17-99 11:31AM : AT&T WIRELESS SVCS-

SENT BY:

	Auth	MtoM	Call	Date	Call Time	Type	Cov	Dial.#/Loca2	Duration	EndOfCall	ICell	LCell	Location1	TripType	Feature
1	Y			02/16/1999	08:54:43	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:06	08:54:49	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
2	Y			02/16/1999	08:54:43	PM	Sp	M	#4432539023	00:00:00:06	08:54:49	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
3	Y			02/16/1999	07:17:24	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:06	07:17:30	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
4	Y			02/16/1999	07:17:24	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:06	07:17:30	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
5	Y			02/16/1999	02:46:32	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-2495	00:00:00:40	02:47:12	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
6	Y			02/16/1999	02:45:59	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:18	02:46:17	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
7	Y			02/16/1999	02:45:59	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:18	02:46:17	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
8	Y			02/16/1999	02:45:59	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:18	02:46:17	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
9	Y			02/16/1999	02:28:45	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:30	02:29:15	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
10	Y			02/16/1999	02:28:45	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:30	02:29:15	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
11	Y			02/15/1999	09:17:54	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:04	09:17:58	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
12	Y			02/15/1999	09:17:54	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:04	09:17:58	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
13	Y			02/15/1999	06:28:20	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:11	06:28:31	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
14	Y			02/15/1999	05:18:37	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:26	05:19:03	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
15	Y			02/15/1999	04:23:01	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064	00:00:00:05	04:23:06	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
16	Y			02/15/1999	03:49:09	PM	Lcl	H	410-203-9044	00:00:00:38	03:49:47	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
17	Y			02/15/1999	03:37:45	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-2899	00:00:00:57	03:38:42	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
18	Y			02/15/1999	02:47:57	PM	Lcl	H	301-345-8888	00:00:00:32	02:48:29	PM	DC 4196Washington1-B		
19	Y	Y		02/15/1999	01:21:43	PM	Lcl	H	410-340-7374	00:00:00:42	01:22:25	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
20	Y			02/15/1999	01:19:31	PM	Inc	H		00:00:01:19	01:20:50	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
21	Y			02/15/1999	01:18:38	PM	Lcl	H	410-813-2817	00:00:00:09	01:18:47	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
22	Y			02/15/1999	01:05:00	PM	Inc	H		00:00:01:16	01:06:16	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
23	Y			02/15/1999	12:16:43	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519	00:00:00:16	12:16:59	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
24	Y			02/15/1999	12:11:37	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:34	12:12:11	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
25	Y			02/15/1999	12:09:23	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519	00:00:00:21	12:09:44	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
26	Y			02/15/1999	10:54:27	AM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519	00:00:00:22	10:54:49	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
27	Y			02/15/1999	10:08:50	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:56	10:09:46	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
28	Y			02/15/1999	10:08:50	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:56	10:09:46	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
29	Y			02/15/1999	10:08:50	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:56	10:09:46	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
30	Y			02/15/1999	09:23:27	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:31	09:23:58	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
31	Y			02/15/1999	09:23:27	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:31	09:23:58	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
32	Y			02/15/1999	09:06:15	AM	Inc	H		00:00:01:11	09:07:26	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
33	Y			02/15/1999	09:06:15	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:01:11	09:07:26	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
34	Y			02/15/1999	09:06:15	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:01:11	09:07:26	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
35	Y			02/15/1999	12:04:04	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:32	12:04:36	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
36	Y			02/15/1999	12:04:04	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:32	12:04:36	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
37	Y			02/14/1999	10:26:55	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:28	10:27:23	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
38	Y			02/14/1999	10:26:55	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:28	10:27:23	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
39	Y			02/14/1999	10:26:55	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:28	10:27:23	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
40	Y			02/14/1999	09:35:59	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:28	09:36:27	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
41	Y			02/14/1999	09:35:59	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:28	09:36:27	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
42	Y			02/14/1999	09:34:56	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-2899	00:00:00:57	09:35:53	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
43	Y			02/14/1999	07:48:43	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:16	07:48:59	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
44	Y			02/14/1999	07:17:30	PM	Lcl	H	301-603-0657	00:00:10:14	07:27:44	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
45	Y			02/14/1999	06:28:38	PM	Inc	H		00:00:09:01	06:37:39	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
46	Y			02/14/1999	06:09:53	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:20	06:10:13	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
47	Y			02/14/1999	06:09:06	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519	00:00:00:09	06:09:15	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
48	Y			02/14/1999	01:18:46	PM	Lcl	H	410-247-5655	00:00:01:10	01:19:56	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
49	Y			02/14/1999	11:28:11	AM	Lcl	H	610-526-5999	00:00:11:48	11:39:59	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
50	Y	Y		02/14/1999	11:09:53	AM	Lcl	H	240-401-1236	00:00:00:40	11:10:33	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
51	Y			02/14/1999	11:06:34	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:04	11:06:38	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
52	Y			02/14/1999	11:06:34	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:04	11:06:38	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
53	Y			02/14/1999	03:08:13	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:05	03:08:18	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
54	Y			02/14/1999	03:08:13	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:05	03:08:18	AM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
55	Y			02/13/1999	11:46:50	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:07	11:46:57	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
56	Y			02/13/1999	11:46:50	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:07	11:46:57	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		CFO
57	Y			02/13/1999	09:07:13	PM	Lcl	H	410-833-5103	00:00:00:16	09:07:29	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		
58	Y			02/13/1999	08:51:07	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:34	08:51:41	PM	DC 4196Washington2-B		

SENT BY:

2-17-99 11:34AM : AT&T WIRELESS SVCS-

914103962257:# 8

327	Y	02/02/1999	02:23:09	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:27	02:23:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
328	Y	02/02/1999	02:23:09	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:27	02:23:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
329	Y	02/02/1999	01:41:10	PM	Inc	K			00:00:00:50	01:42:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
330	Y	02/02/1999	01:41:10	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:50	01:42:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
331	Y	02/01/1999	10:06:10	PM	Inc	H			00:00:01:46	10:08:02	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
332	Y	02/01/1999	10:06:16	PM	Inc	H			00:00:01:46	10:08:02	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
333	Y	02/01/1999	10:04:05	PM	Lcl	H	410-319-1410		00:00:15:16	10:19:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
334	Y	02/01/1999	09:28:51	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:27	09:29:18	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
335	Y	02/01/1999	09:24:10	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519		00:00:00:28	09:24:38	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
336	Y	02/01/1999	09:22:42	PM	Lcl	F	301-603-0657		00:00:00:58	09:23:40	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
337	Y	02/01/1999	06:37:00	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:42	06:37:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
338	Y	02/01/1999	04:28:37	PM	Inc	H			00:00:06:49	04:35:26	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
339	Y	02/01/1999	04:09:13	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-5039		00:00:00:24	04:09:37	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
340	Y	01/31/1999	08:09:55	PM	Inc	H			00:00:01:15	08:11:10	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
341	Y	01/31/1999	07:24:12	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:00	07:24:12	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
342	Y	01/31/1999	07:06:13	PM	Lcl	H	410-655-3740		00:00:00:46	07:06:59	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
343	Y	01/31/1999	07:04:39	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:24	07:05:03	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
344	Y	01/31/1999	07:04:39	PM	Lcl	F	443-253-9023		00:00:00:24	07:05:03	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
345	Y	01/31/1999	07:04:39	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:24	07:05:03	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
346	Y	01/31/1999	07:03:59	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:24	07:04:23	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
347	Y	01/31/1999	07:03:59	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:24	07:04:23	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
348	Y	01/31/1999	06:52:11	PM	Lcl	H	410-869-9498		00:00:00:43	06:52:54	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
349	Y	01/31/1999	06:48:51	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-2186		00:00:00:26	06:49:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
350	Y	01/31/1999	06:48:18	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-4828		00:00:00:19	06:48:37	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
351	Y	01/31/1999	06:02:20	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:38	06:02:58	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
352	Y	01/31/1999	05:58:21	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-4828		00:00:00:39	05:59:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
353	Y	01/31/1999	05:55:49	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495		00:00:00:06	05:55:55	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
354	Y	01/31/1999	05:55:09	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:23	05:55:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
355	Y	01/31/1999	05:51:04	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495		00:00:00:28	05:51:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
356	Y	01/31/1999	05:48:11	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495		00:00:00:54	05:49:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
357	Y	01/31/1999	05:43:25	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:26	05:43:51	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
358	Y	01/31/1999	01:27:16	PM	Lcl	H	301-603-0657		00:00:31:40	01:58:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
359	Y	01/31/1999	01:04:27	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064		00:00:00:07	01:04:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
360	Y	01/31/1999	01:02:54	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064		00:00:00:19	01:03:13	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
361	Y	01/31/1999	12:56:20	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:16	12:56:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
362	Y	01/31/1999	11:57:55	AM	Inc	F			00:00:00:21	11:58:16	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
363	Y	01/31/1999	11:57:55	AM	Inc	K			00:00:00:21	11:58:16	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
364	Y	01/31/1999	11:57:08	AM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064		00:00:00:27	11:57:35	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
365	Y	01/31/1999	11:56:26	AM	Lcl	H	410-998-3540		00:00:00:27	11:56:53	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
366	Y	01/31/1999	11:55:06	AM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064		00:00:01:00	11:56:06	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
367	Y	01/31/1999	11:01:56	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-2186		00:00:00:22	11:02:18	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
368	Y	01/31/1999	10:38:09	AM	Lcl	H	410-737-0761		00:00:00:21	10:38:30	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
369	Y	01/31/1999	10:25:59	AM	Lcl	H	610-526-5999		00:00:00:42	10:26:41	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
370	Y	01/31/1999	10:25:35	AM	Lcl	H	610-526-5999		00:00:00:12	10:25:47	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
371	Y	01/31/1999	10:24:54	AM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495		00:00:00:17	10:25:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
372	Y	01/31/1999	10:15:27	AM	Lcl	F	410-788-8495		00:00:00:21	10:15:48	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
373	Y	01/31/1999	09:31:43	AM	Inc	K			00:00:01:29	09:33:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
374	Y	01/31/1999	09:07:50	AM	Lcl	H	410-752-1393		00:00:00:22	09:08:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
375	Y	01/31/1999	09:06:53	AM	Lcl	H	410-752-1393		00:00:00:42	09:07:35	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
376	Y	01/30/1999	11:01:15	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:12	11:01:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
377	Y	01/30/1999	11:01:15	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:12	11:01:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
378	Y	01/30/1999	10:45:59	PM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704		00:00:00:12	11:01:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
379	Y	01/30/1999	10:44:31	PM	Inc	H			00:00:28:48	11:14:47	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
380	Y	01/30/1999	10:44:31	PM	Inc	H			00:00:01:03	10:45:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
381	Y	01/30/1999	10:32:12	PM	Inc	H			00:00:01:03	10:45:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
382	Y	01/30/1999	10:32:12	PM	Inc	F			00:00:12:55	10:45:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
383	Y	01/30/1999	10:17:20	PM	Inc	H			00:00:12:55	10:45:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
384	Y	01/30/1999	10:07:44	PM	Inc	H			00:00:16:31	10:33:51	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
385	Y	01/30/1999	10:06:41	PM	Lcl	H	410-452-6136		00:00:01:50	10:09:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
386	Y	01/30/1999	10:06:04	PM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704		00:00:00:24	10:07:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
387	Y	01/30/1999	09:52:18	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:11	10:06:15	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
388	Y	01/30/1999	09:37:25	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:47	09:53:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
389	Y	01/30/1999	09:37:25	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:01:35	09:39:08	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
390	Y	01/30/1999	09:37:25	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:01:35	09:39:08	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
391	Y	01/30/1999	09:25:44	PM	Lcl	H	301-603-0657		00:00:01:35	09:39:08	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
392	Y	01/30/1999	09:10:19	PM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704		00:00:00:28	09:26:12	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
393	Y	01/30/1999	09:07:45	PM	Lcl	F	410-813-1817		00:00:07:18	09:17:37	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
									00:00:00:09	09:07:54	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B

CFO

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

CFO

CW

SENT BY:

2-17-99 ; 11:35AM ; AT&T WIRELESS SVCS-

914103962257;# 8

394	Y	01/30/1999	08:19:33	PM	Lcl	H	301-603-0657	00:00:42:31	09:02:04	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
395	Y	01/30/1999	08:12:39	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9712	00:00:01:25	08:14:04	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
396	Y	01/30/1999	08:06:50	PM	Lcl	H	410-298-3733	00:00:00:43	08:07:33	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
397	Y	01/30/1999	08:03:25	PM	Lcl	H	410-313-9136	00:00:00:06	08:03:31	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
398	Y	01/30/1999	08:01:52	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:41	08:02:33	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
399	Y	01/30/1999	08:01:52	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:41	08:02:33	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
400	Y	01/30/1999	08:01:52	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:41	08:02:33	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
401	Y	01/30/1999	08:00:46	PM	Lcl	H	410-833-9196	00:00:00:54	08:01:40	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
402	Y	01/30/1999	07:41:47	PM	Inc	H		09:00:01:49	07:43:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
403	Y	01/30/1999	07:41:47	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:01:49	07:43:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
404	Y	01/30/1999	07:21:46	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:43	07:22:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
405	Y	01/30/1999	07:21:46	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:43	07:22:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
406	Y	01/30/1999	07:21:46	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:43	07:22:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
407	Y	01/30/1999	07:18:47	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:20	07:19:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
408	Y	01/30/1999	07:18:47	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:20	07:19:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
409	Y	01/30/1999	07:04:00	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:21	07:04:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
410	Y	01/30/1999	07:04:00	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:21	07:04:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
411	Y	01/30/1999	06:45:37	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:30	06:46:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
412	Y	01/30/1999	06:45:37	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:30	06:46:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
413	Y	01/30/1999	06:45:37	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:30	06:46:07	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
414	Y	01/30/1999	06:40:22	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:59	06:41:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
415	Y	01/30/1999	06:40:22	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:59	06:41:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
416	Y	01/30/1999	06:01:26	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:26	06:01:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
417	Y	01/30/1999	06:01:26	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:26	06:01:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
418	Y	01/30/1999	06:01:26	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:26	06:01:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
419	Y	01/30/1999	05:52:47	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:27	05:53:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
420	Y	01/30/1999	05:52:47	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:27	05:53:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
421	Y	01/30/1999	04:15:43	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:13	04:15:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
422	Y	01/30/1999	04:15:43	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:13	04:15:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
423	Y	01/30/1999	04:15:43	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:13	04:15:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
424	Y	01/30/1999	02:24:43	PM	Inc	H		00:00:04:12	02:28:55	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
425	Y	01/30/1999	02:24:43	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:04:12	02:28:55	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
426	Y	01/30/1999	02:24:43	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:04:12	02:28:55	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
427	Y	01/30/1999	02:22:33	PM	Inc	H		00:00:01:37	02:24:10	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
428	Y	01/30/1999	02:22:33	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:01:37	02:24:10	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
429	Y	01/30/1999	02:22:33	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:01:37	02:24:10	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
430	Y	01/30/1999	01:34:44	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:19	01:35:03	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
431	Y	01/30/1999	01:34:44	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:19	01:35:03	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
432	Y	01/30/1999	10:41:08	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:41	10:41:49	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
433	Y	01/30/1999	10:41:08	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:41	10:41:49	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
434	Y	01/30/1999	10:41:08	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:41	10:41:49	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
435	Y	01/30/1999	10:33:56	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:55	10:34:51	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
436	Y	01/30/1999	10:33:56	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:55	10:34:51	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
437	Y	01/30/1999	01:38:00	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:23	01:38:23	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
438	Y	01/30/1999	01:38:00	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:23	01:38:23	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
439	Y	01/30/1999	01:38:00	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:23	01:38:23	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
440	Y	01/30/1999	01:37:26	AM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064	00:00:00:23	01:37:49	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
441	Y	01/30/1999	01:37:03	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:49	01:37:52	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
442	Y	01/30/1999	01:37:03	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:49	01:37:52	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
443	Y	01/29/1999	10:11:41	PM	Lcl	H	410-944-1610	00:00:01:55	10:13:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
444	Y	01/29/1999	09:29:37	PM	Lcl	H	410-298-8414	00:00:00:32	09:30:09	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
445	Y	01/29/1999	09:06:44	PM	Lcl	H	410-850-8999	00:00:00:21	09:07:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
446	Y	01/29/1999	09:05:43	PM	Lcl	H	410-850-8999	00:00:00:33	09:06:16	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
447	Y	01/29/1999	06:55:35	PM	Inc	H		00:00:16:44	07:12:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
448	Y	01/29/1999	05:44:45	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:35	05:45:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
449	Y	01/29/1999	05:44:45	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:35	05:45:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
450	Y	01/29/1999	05:44:45	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:35	05:45:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
451	Y	01/29/1999	05:42:59	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:35	05:43:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
452	Y	01/29/1999	05:42:59	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:35	05:43:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
453	Y	01/29/1999	05:38:20	PM	Lcl	H	410-367-4971	00:00:00:49	05:39:09	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
454	Y	01/29/1999	05:37:45	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:15	05:38:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
455	Y	01/29/1999	05:15:57	PM	Lcl	H	410-887-6239	00:00:00:33	05:16:30	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
456	Y	01/29/1999	05:14:26	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:30	05:14:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
457	Y	01/29/1999	05:14:26	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:30	05:14:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
458	Y	01/29/1999	05:14:26	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:30	05:14:56	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
459	Y	01/29/1999	03:39:39	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:25	03:40:04	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
460	Y	01/29/1999	03:39:39	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:25	03:40:04	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO

914103962257:#10

2-17-99 ; 11:36AM ; AT&T WIRELESS SVCS-

SENT BY:

461	Y	01/29/1999	02:21:47	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:33	02:22:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
462	Y	01/29/1999	02:21:47	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:33	02:22:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
463	Y	01/29/1999	02:21:47	PM	Sp	K	#4432539023		00:00:00:33	02:22:20	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
464	Y	01/29/1999	02:09:48	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:29	02:10:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
465	Y	01/29/1999	02:09:48	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:29	02:10:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
466	Y	01/29/1999	01:20:39	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:07	01:20:46	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
467	Y	01/29/1999	01:20:39	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:07	01:20:46	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
468	Y	01/29/1999	01:02:37	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:05	01:02:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
469	Y	01/29/1999	01:02:37	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:05	01:02:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
470	Y	01/29/1999	11:19:04	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:08	11:19:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
471	Y	01/29/1999	11:19:04	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:08	11:19:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
472	Y	01/29/1999	11:19:04	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:08	11:19:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
473	Y	01/29/1999	11:19:04	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:08	11:19:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
474	Y	01/29/1999	11:00:55	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:06	11:01:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
475	Y	01/29/1999	11:00:55	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:06	11:01:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
476	Y	01/29/1999	11:00:55	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:06	11:01:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
477	Y	01/29/1999	11:00:55	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:06	11:01:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
478	Y	01/29/1999	07:52:12	AM	Lcl	H	410-298-8414		00:00:00:06	07:52:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
479	Y	01/29/1999	07:52:12	AM	Lcl	H	410-298-8414		00:00:00:06	07:52:12	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
480	Y	01/29/1999	07:50:59	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:05	07:51:04	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
481	Y	01/29/1999	07:50:59	AM	Inc	H			00:00:00:05	07:51:04	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
482	Y	01/29/1999	07:50:59	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:05	07:51:04	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
483	Y	01/29/1999	07:50:59	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:05	07:51:04	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
484	Y	01/29/1999	07:49:31	AM	Lcl	H	410-499-5396		00:00:01:55	07:51:26	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
485	Y	01/29/1999	07:49:31	AM	Lcl	H	410-499-5396		00:00:01:55	07:51:26	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
486	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
487	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
488	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
489	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
490	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
491	Y	01/28/1999	11:53:11	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:33	11:53:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
492	Y	01/28/1999	11:31:48	PM	Lcl	H	410-362-0599		00:00:00:12	11:32:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
493	Y	01/28/1999	11:31:48	PM	Lcl	H	410-362-0599		00:00:00:12	11:32:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
494	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
495	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
496	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
497	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
498	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
499	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:50	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:54	11:30:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
500	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
501	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
502	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
503	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
504	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
505	Y	01/28/1999	11:29:07	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023		00:00:00:29	11:29:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
506	Y	01/28/1999	11:21:09	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:33	11:21:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
507	Y	01/28/1999	11:21:09	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:33	11:21:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
508	Y	01/28/1999	11:21:09	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:33	11:21:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
509	Y	01/28/1999	11:21:09	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:33	11:21:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
510	Y	01/28/1999	10:33:39	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:21	10:34:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
511	Y	01/28/1999	10:33:39	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:21	10:34:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
512	Y	01/28/1999	10:33:39	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:21	10:34:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
513	Y	01/28/1999	10:33:39	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:21	10:34:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
514	Y	01/28/1999	10:08:44	PM	Lcl	H	410-362-0599		00:00:00:17	10:09:01	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
515	Y	01/28/1999	09:51:59	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:45	09:52:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
516	Y	01/28/1999	09:51:59	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:45	09:52:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
517	Y	01/28/1999	09:51:59	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:45	09:52:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
518	Y	01/28/1999	09:51:59	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:45	09:52:44	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
519	Y	01/28/1999	09:49:48	PM	Inc	H			00:00:03:39	09:53:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
520	Y	01/28/1999	09:49:48	PM	Inc	H			00:00:03:39	09:53:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
521	Y	01/28/1999	09:49:48	PM	Inc	H			00:00:03:39	09:53:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
522	Y	01/28/1999	09:49:48	PM	Inc	H			00:00:03:39	09:53:27	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
523	Y	01/28/1999	09:48:40	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-5236		00:00:00:48	09:49:28	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
524	Y	01/28/1999	09:48:40	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-5236		00:00:00:48	09:49:28	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
525	Y	01/28/1999	09:44:07	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:07	09:44:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
526	Y	01/28/1999	09:44:07	PM	Inc	H			00:00:00:07	09:44:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	
527	Y	01/28/1999	09:44:07	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023		00:00:00:07	09:44:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO

SENT BY: 2-17-99 11:38AM AT&T WIRELESS SVCS- 914103962257;#13

662	Y	01/26/1999	04:04:13	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	03:00:01:16	04:05:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
663	Y	01/26/1999	10:36:19	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:36	10:36:55	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
664	Y	01/26/1999	10:36:19	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:36	10:36:55	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
665	Y	01/26/1999	10:22:02	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:41	10:22:43	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
666	Y	01/26/1999	10:22:02	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:41	10:22:43	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
667	Y	01/25/1999	11:10:47	PM	Inc	H		00:00:23:49	11:34:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
668	Y	01/25/1999	11:10:47	PM	Inc	H		00:00:23:49	11:34:36	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CFO
669	Y	01/25/1999	10:51:51	PM	Lcl	H	410-455-0251	00:00:19:25	11:11:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
670	Y	01/25/1999	09:31:14	PM	Lcl	H	410-747-5351	00:00:00:32	09:31:46	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
671	Y	01/25/1999	09:13:08	PM	Lcl	H	410-747-5351	00:00:01:23	09:14:31	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
672	Y	01/25/1999	05:53:10	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:11	05:53:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
673	Y	01/25/1999	05:53:10	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:11	05:53:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
674	Y	01/25/1999	03:44:56	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:11	05:53:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
675	Y	01/25/1999	02:29:51	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:22	03:45:18	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
676	Y	01/25/1999	02:29:51	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:26	02:30:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
677	Y	01/25/1999	02:29:51	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:26	02:30:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
678	Y	01/25/1999	01:57:07	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:05	01:57:12	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
679	Y	01/25/1999	01:57:07	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:05	01:57:12	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
680	Y	01/25/1999	01:19:54	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:20	01:20:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
681	Y	01/25/1999	01:19:54	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:20	01:20:14	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
682	Y	01/25/1999	07:59:36	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:35	08:00:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
683	Y	01/25/1999	07:59:36	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:35	08:00:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
684	Y	01/25/1999	07:59:36	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:35	08:00:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
685	Y	01/25/1999	07:58:51	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:27	07:59:18	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
686	Y	01/25/1999	07:58:51	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:27	07:59:18	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
687	Y	01/25/1999	07:58:51	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:27	07:59:18	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
688	Y	01/24/1999	11:27:55	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:05	11:28:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
689	Y	01/24/1999	11:27:55	PM	Sp	H	4432539023	00:00:00:05	11:28:00	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
690	Y	01/24/1999	10:35:55	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:05	10:36:23	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
691	Y	01/24/1999	10:35:55	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:05	10:36:23	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
692	Y	01/24/1999	07:39:31	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:28	07:45:22	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
693	Y	01/24/1999	07:39:31	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:28	07:45:22	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
694	Y	01/24/1999	01:34:46	PM	Lcl	H	410-998-3540	00:00:05:51	07:45:22	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
695	Y	01/24/1999	01:11:19	PM	Lcl	F	301-603-0657	00:00:00:12	01:34:58	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
696	Y	01/24/1999	01:10:28	PM	Inc	H		00:00:16:29	01:27:48	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
697	Y	01/24/1999	01:10:28	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:23	01:10:51	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
698	Y	01/24/1999	01:10:28	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:23	01:10:51	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
699	Y	01/24/1999	11:55:31	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:21	11:55:52	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
700	Y	01/24/1999	11:55:31	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:21	11:55:52	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
701	Y	01/23/1999	11:46:22	PM	Inc	H		00:00:03:01	11:51:04	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
702	Y	01/23/1999	11:46:22	PM	Lcl	H	410-681-5073	00:00:00:19	11:46:41	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
703	Y	01/23/1999	10:48:17	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495	00:00:00:32	10:48:49	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
704	Y	01/23/1999	10:26:45	PM	Lcl	H	410-750-9617	00:00:00:37	10:27:22	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
705	Y	01/23/1999	10:13:56	PM	Lcl	H	410-340-7374	00:00:06:59	10:20:55	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
706	Y	01/23/1999	10:05:34	PM	Lcl	H	410-750-9617	00:00:07:18	10:12:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
707	Y	01/23/1999	09:53:02	PM	Lcl	H	410-869-9498	00:00:00:36	09:53:38	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
708	Y	01/23/1999	09:38:24	PM	Lcl	H	410-340-7374	00:00:00:28	09:38:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
709	Y	01/23/1999	08:26:37	PM	Lcl	H	703-878-9218	00:00:00:15	08:26:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
710	Y	01/23/1999	08:00:01	PM	Inc	H		00:00:03:01	08:03:02	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
711	Y	01/23/1999	08:00:01	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:03:01	08:03:02	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
712	Y	01/23/1999	08:00:01	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:03:01	08:03:02	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
713	Y	01/23/1999	07:59:18	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:31	07:59:49	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
714	Y	01/23/1999	07:59:18	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:31	07:59:49	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
715	Y	01/23/1999	07:59:18	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:31	07:59:49	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
716	Y	01/23/1999	07:58:59	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:26	07:59:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
717	Y	01/23/1999	07:58:59	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:26	07:59:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
718	Y	01/23/1999	07:58:59	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:26	07:59:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
719	Y	01/23/1999	07:55:05	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:06	07:59:05	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
720	Y	01/23/1999	07:55:05	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:02:27	07:57:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
721	Y	01/23/1999	07:55:05	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:02:27	07:57:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
722	Y	01/23/1999	07:52:22	PM	Inc	H		00:00:02:27	07:57:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
723	Y	01/23/1999	07:52:22	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:02:28	07:54:50	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
724	Y	01/23/1999	07:52:22	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:02:28	07:54:50	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
725	Y	01/23/1999	06:51:25	PM	Lcl	H	410-859-9498	00:00:02:28	07:54:50	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
726	Y	01/23/1999	06:47:14	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:02	06:47:16	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
727	Y	01/23/1999	06:47:14	PM	Lcl	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:02	06:47:16	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW
728	Y	01/23/1999	06:21:50	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:39	06:22:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B	CW

SENT BY: 2-17-98 11:42AM AT&T WIRELESS SVCS-

914109962257;#17

930	Y	01/16/1999	05:09:27	FM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064	00:00:00:26	05:09:27	FM	DC	4196Washington2-B
931	Y	01/16/1999	05:04:52	FM	Lcl	H	410-788-8519	00:00:01:03	05:05:55	FM	DC	4196Washington2-B
932	Y	01/16/1999	02:18:55	PM	Lcl	H	301-603-0657	00:00:02:33	02:21:28	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
933	Y	01/16/1999	12:35:48	PM	Inc	H		00:00:04:28	12:40:16	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
934	Y	01/16/1999	12:25:27	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:15	12:25:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
935	Y	01/16/1999	11:59:16	AM	Lcl	H	410-813-1817	00:00:00:17	11:59:33	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
936	Y	01/16/1999	10:57:03	AM	Lcl	H	410-265-5622	00:00:01:01	10:58:04	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
937	Y	01/16/1999	10:03:10	AM	Lcl	H	410-265-5622	00:00:03:38	10:06:48	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
938	Y	01/16/1999	09:38:05	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:04	09:38:09	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
939	Y	01/16/1999	09:38:05	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:04	09:38:09	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
940	Y	01/16/1999	01:32:05	AM	Nt'l	H	410-788-5039	00:00:00:36	01:32:41	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
941	Y	01/16/1999	12:44:44	AM	Lcl	H	410-526-0358	00:00:07:25	12:52:09	AM	MD	13Greenbelt4-A
942	Y	01/16/1999	12:07:15	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:46	12:06:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
943	Y	01/16/1999	12:07:15	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:46	12:08:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
944	Y	01/16/1999	12:07:15	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:46	12:08:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
945	Y	01/16/1999	12:06:36	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:25	12:07:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
946	Y	01/16/1999	12:06:36	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-9023	00:00:00:25	12:07:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
947	Y	01/16/1999	12:06:36	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:25	12:07:01	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
948	Y	01/15/1999	11:44:47	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-0620	00:00:00:05	11:44:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
949	Y	01/15/1999	11:39:33	PM	Lcl	H	410-233-4650	00:00:00:06	11:39:39	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
950	Y	01/15/1999	11:38:25	PM	Lcl	H	410-390-1184	00:00:00:32	11:38:57	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
951	Y	01/15/1999	11:26:07	PM	Lcl	H	410-390-1184	00:00:00:05	11:26:12	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
952	Y	01/15/1999	11:00:36	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495	00:00:01:06	11:01:42	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
953	Y	01/15/1999	10:54:36	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:30	10:55:06	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
954	Y	01/15/1999	10:54:36	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:30	10:55:06	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
955	Y	01/15/1999	10:50:58	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:03	10:51:01	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
956	Y	01/15/1999	10:50:58	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:03	10:51:01	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
957	Y	01/15/1999	10:48:27	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:05	10:48:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
958	Y	01/15/1999	10:48:27	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:05	10:48:32	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
959	Y	02/15/1999	10:47:26	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:03	10:47:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
960	Y	01/15/1999	10:47:26	PM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:03	10:47:29	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
961	Y	01/15/1999	10:29:30	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:53	10:30:23	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
962	Y	01/15/1999	10:19:36	PM	Nt'l	H	410-788-8495	00:00:00:32	10:20:08	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
963	Y	01/15/1999	10:18:53	PM	Nt'l	H	410-407-7406	00:00:00:28	10:19:21	PM	MD	13Greenbelt4-A
964	Y	01/15/1999	10:09:06	PM	Nt'l	H	410-813-1817	00:00:00:24	10:09:30	PM	MD	13Greenbelt4-A
965	Y	01/15/1999	07:47:30	PM	Lcl	H	410-747-5351	00:00:03:23	07:50:53	PM	MD	13Greenbelt4-A
966	Y	01/15/1999	07:36:10	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495	00:00:00:43	07:36:53	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
967	Y	01/15/1999	07:31:07	PM	Inc	H		00:00:02:27	07:33:34	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
968	Y	01/15/1999	07:18:42	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064	00:00:01:17	07:19:59	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
969	Y	01/15/1999	07:17:26	PM	Inc	H		00:00:00:45	07:18:21	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
970	Y	01/15/1999	07:03:20	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-1064	00:00:00:20	07:03:40	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
971	Y	01/15/1999	06:43:27	PM	Lcl	H	410-869-9498	00:00:01:26	06:44:53	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
972	Y	01/15/1999	06:13:30	PM	Lcl	F	410-922-9704	00:00:02:22	06:15:52	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
973	Y	01/15/1999	06:12:10	PM	Lcl	R	410-788-8519	00:00:01:05	06:13:15	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
974	Y	01/15/1999	06:11:47	PM	Lcl	H	410-788-8495	00:00:00:07	06:11:54	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
975	Y	01/15/1999	02:10:58	PM	Lcl	H	*6741C7506970	00:00:02:01	02:12:59	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
976	Y	01/15/1999	11:29:34	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:07	11:29:41	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
977	Y	01/15/1999	11:29:34	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:07	11:29:41	AM	DC	4196Washington1-B
978	Y	01/15/1999	10:22:58	AM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704	00:00:01:45	10:24:43	AM	DC	4196Washington1-B
979	Y	01/15/1999	10:07:40	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:02	10:07:42	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
980	Y	01/15/1999	10:07:40	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:02	10:07:42	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
981	Y	01/15/1999	10:04:09	AM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704	00:00:00:02	10:04:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
982	Y	01/15/1999	09:59:47	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:24	10:00:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
983	Y	01/15/1999	09:59:47	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:24	10:00:11	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
984	Y	01/15/1999	09:44:13	AM	Lcl	H	410-265-5622	00:00:03:00	09:47:13	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
985	Y	01/15/1999	09:43:09	AM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704	00:00:00:21	09:43:30	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
986	Y	01/15/1999	09:41:45	AM	Lcl	H	410-869-9498	00:00:01:02	09:42:47	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
987	Y	01/15/1999	09:37:31	AM	Lcl	H	410-869-9498	00:00:03:01	09:40:32	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
988	Y	01/15/1999	09:24:03	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:02	09:24:05	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
989	Y	01/15/1999	09:24:03	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:02	09:24:05	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
990	Y	01/15/1999	09:21:17	AM	Inc	H		00:00:00:39	09:21:56	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
991	Y	01/15/1999	09:21:17	AM	Sp	H	#4432539023	00:00:00:39	09:21:56	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
992	Y	01/15/1999	08:10:40	AM	Lcl	H	410-922-9704	00:00:02:02	08:12:42	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
993	Y	01/15/1999	08:08:31	AM	Lcl	H	410-265-5622	00:00:00:05	08:08:26	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
994	Y	01/15/1999	12:02:26	AM	Lcl	H	443-253-2186	00:00:00:01	12:02:27	AM	DC	4196Washington2-B
995	Y	01/14/1999	11:51:10	PM	Lcl	H	443-253-2186	00:00:00:08	11:51:18	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B
996	Y	01/14/1999	11:47:38	PM	Lcl	H	410-480-9590	00:00:01:39	11:49:17	PM	DC	4196Washington2-B

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

CFO

State's Attachment 5

IN THE
COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS OF MARYLAND

SEPTEMBER TERM, 2013

NO. 2519

ADNAN SYED,

Appellant

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Appellee

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY
(Martin P. Welch, Sr., Judge)

BRIEF OF APPELLEE

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland

THIRUVENDRAN VIGNARAJAH
Deputy Attorney General

EDWARD J. KELLEY
Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General
200 Saint Paul Place
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410) 576-6300
oag@oag.state.md.us

Counsel for Appellee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATEMENT OF THE CASE..	1
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.	2
A. The Murder of Hae Min Lee.	2
1. The Verdict of the Jury.	2
2. The Evidence at Trial.	3
B. The Petition for Post-Conviction Relief.	10
1. The Pursuit of an Alibi.	12
2. The Purported Alibi of Asia McClain.	13
C. The Denial of Post-Conviction Relief.	15
ARGUMENT:	
I. THE COURT RIGHTLY REJECTED SYED’S CLAIM THAT COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO ASIA MCCLAIN.	18
A. Syed failed to establish that Gutierrez’ strategy and judgment with respect to an alibi defense based upon Asia McClainé was constitutionally deficient.	19
B. Syed also failed to establish prejudice..	23
1. Syed’s claim of ineffective assistance fails as a matter of law because Syed did not produce the supposed alibi witness at the post-conviction hearing.	23

	<u>Page</u>
2. Nor can Syed establish prejudice where the State presented overwhelming evidence in support of the jury’s verdict.	25
II. FAILING TO SEEK A PLEA WHERE NONE HAS BEEN OFFERED DOES NOT CONSTITUTE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.	26
A. Failure to seek a plea offer from prosecutors when none has been offered is not a cognizable constitutional claim under the Sixth Amendment.	27
B. Syed failed to prove that Gutierrez acted deficiently or that plea negotiations were viable for either Syed or the State.	28
C. Syed failed to establish that this alleged ineffective counsel claim prejudiced the outcome of his criminal proceedings.	30
CONCLUSION.	34
PERTINENT PROVISIONS.	35
APPENDIX.	Apx. 1-4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Aguilar v. Alexander</i> , 125 F.3d 815 (9th Cir. 1997).	31
<i>Code v. Montgomery</i> , 799 F.2d 1481 (11th Cir. 1986).	24
<i>Cole v. Slayton</i> , 378 F.Supp. 364 (W.D. Va. 1974).	30
<i>Freund v. Butterworth</i> , 165 F.3d 839 (11th Cir. 1999).	29
<i>Griffin v. Warden</i> , 970 F.2d 1355 (4th Cir. 1992).	22, 24

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Grooms v. Solem</i> , 923 F.2d 88 (8th Cir. 1991).....	24
<i>In re Parris W.</i> , 363 Md. 717 (2001).....	24
<i>Johns v. Perini</i> , 462 F.2d 1308 (6th Cir. 1972)	24
<i>Kulbicki v. State</i> , 440 Md. 33 (2014)	17
<i>Lafler v. Cooper</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1376 (2012).....	27, <i>passim</i>
<i>Martin v. Rose</i> , 717 F.2d 295 (6th Cir. 1983).....	30
<i>Mason v. Balcom</i> , 531 F.2d 717 (5th Cir. 1976)	30
<i>Michel v. Louisiana</i> , 350 U.S. 91 (1955)	18
<i>Missouri v. Frye</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1399 (2012).....	27, <i>passim</i>
<i>Montgomery v. Peterson</i> , 846 F.2d 407 (7th Cir. 1988)	24
<i>Newman v. Vasbinder</i> , 259 F. App'x 851 (6th Cir. 2008) (unpublished)	29
<i>State v. Latham</i> , 182 Md. App. 597 (2008)	18
<i>State v. Lloyd</i> , 48 Md. App. 535 (1981)	22
<i>State v. Mahoney</i> , 16 Md. App. 193 (1972)	23
<i>State v. Purvey</i> , 129 Md. App. 1 (1999)	18
<i>State v. Simms</i> , 420 Md. 705 (2011)	21
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> , 466 U.S. 668 (1984)	17, <i>passim</i>
<i>Tosh v. Lockhart</i> , 879 F.2d 412 (8th Cir. 1989)	24
<i>United States v. Gordon</i> , 979 F.Supp. 337 (E.D. Pa. 1997).....	29

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Veney v. Warden</i> , 259 Md. 437 (1970)	16, 23
<i>Weatherford v. Bursey</i> , 429 U.S. 545 (1977)	27
<i>White v. State</i> , 324 Md. 626 (1991)	32, 33
<i>White v. Warden</i> , 1 Md. App. 670 (1967)	23
<i>Williams v. Florida</i> , 399 U.S. 78 (1970)	21
<i>Williams v. State</i> , 326 Md. 367 (1992)	28

Constitutional Provisions

United States Constitution

Sixth Amendment	17, 27, 33
-----------------------	------------

Rules

Maryland Rule of Procedure:

Rule 8-131.	32
------------------	----

Rules of Professional Conduct:

Rule 3.3.	22
----------------	----

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

Letter from Syed to Court	Apx. 1
Notice of Alibi Witnesses	Apx. 2-4

IN THE
COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS OF MARYLAND

SEPTEMBER TERM, 2013

NO. 2519

ADNAN SYED,

Appellant

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Appellee

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY
(Martin P. Welch, Sr., Judge)

BRIEF OF APPELLEE

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellee, the State of Maryland, accepts the Statement of the Case set forth in the brief of Appellant, Adnan Syed.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court correctly dismissed Adnan Syed's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel with respect to his attorney's judgment not to pursue an alibi defense dependent on a single potential witness, Asia McClain?
2. Whether the court correctly rejected Syed's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel for declining to act on Syed's alleged request to seek a plea offer from the prosecution?

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The Murder of Hae Min Lee

On January 13, 1999, Adnan Syed strangled to death and buried in a shallow grave his ex-girlfriend, 18-year-old, Hae Min Lee. (T. 2/2/00 at 39-41; T. 2/23/00 at 22-23, 38). Syed and Lee, both students at Woodlawn High School, had broken up and reunited at least twice during the course of their turbulent ten-month relationship, but never before had Lee become involved with someone else. (T. 1/28/00 at 237-40; T. 2/16/00 at 300; State's Exhibit 2). That changed two weeks before the murder, when Lee went on a first date with a new romantic interest, an older co-worker named Donald Cliendinst. (T. 2/1/00 at 72).

The week of the murder, as Lee's affection for Syed visibly flickered, her relationship with Cliendinst at once became sexually intimate and public at school. (*See* T. 1/28/00 at 239; T. 2/1/00 at 88; T. 2/4/00 at 12). That same week, Syed activated a new cell phone, which was instrumental in Lee's murder, and told Jay Wilds — an accessory to the crime enlisted by Syed — that he intended “to kill that bitch” (referring to Lee) because of how she was treating him. (T. 1/28/00 at 185; T. 2/4/00 at 125-26; T. 2/18/00 at 186). On the morning of January 13, Syed lent Wilds his vehicle and his new cell phone and directed him to await his call. (T. 2/4/00 at 125-26). That day at Woodlawn, Syed lured Lee away from the high school campus, falsely claiming he needed a ride to pick up his car. (T. 1/28/00 at 209; T. 1/31/00 at 8). Syed then strangled Lee inside her vehicle and stashed her body in the trunk of the car. (T. 2/2/00 at 39-41; T. 2/4/00 at 131). After the murder, Syed bragged to Wilds that he had killed Lee with his bare hands and that she had tried to apologize to Syed with her last breath. (T. 2/4/00 at 142-43). The two men disposed of Lee's crumpled body in Leakin Park in Baltimore City and abandoned her car near Edmondson Avenue. (T. 2/4/00 at 148-51; T. 1/27/00 at 202).

1. The Verdict of the Jury

On February 25, 2000, Syed was convicted of murder and all related charges at the conclusion of a six-week trial during which the State presented overwhelming evidence of Syed's guilt. (T. 2/25/00 at 133-35). Syed and his celebrated attorney, Christina Gutierrez, received a

preview of the prosecution's case when Syed's first trial ended with the judge granting a defense motion for a mistrial. (T. 12/15/99 at 255). Emboldened after speaking with jurors following the mistrial, the defense was confident in its case and eager for trial. (T. 1/10/00 at 33).

At the second trial, as set forth in greater detail below, the State's case included, *inter alia*, the testimony of Wilds who helped Syed bury the victim and later led police to the victim's car (T. 2/4/00 at 115-64); witnesses who spoke of Syed's possessive behavior toward Lee, his ploy to get a ride from Lee after school on the day she disappeared, and his presence with Wilds that afternoon and evening (T. 2/17/00 at 136-37; T. 1/28/00 at 209; T. 1/31/00 at 8; T. 2/15/00 at 193; T. 2/16/00 at 209-11); toll records and tower location data corresponding to Syed's cell phone, which corroborated the testimony of Wilds and other witnesses, and placed Syed at Leakin Park that night a short distance from where Lee's corpse was unearthed (*See* T. 2/8/00 & T. 2/9/00); a map page to Leakin Park, ripped from a map book with Syed's palm print on the back cover, both left in Lee's abandoned car (T. 1/31/00 at 58-60; T. 2/1/00 at 24-29); the diary of Hae Min Lee recounting the decline of her relationship with Syed and the bloom of her love for Cliendinst (State's Exhibit 2); a letter seized from Syed's bedroom, written by Lee imploring Syed to respect her wishes and move on, with the ominous words "I'm going to kill" written in a separate script on the back side of the note (T. 1/28/00 at 247-55); as well as Syed's peculiar conduct after the murder and his incongruous statements to police (T. 1/28/00 at 26-29, 149; T. 1/31/00 at 8, 25-27; T. 2/16/00 at 209-13).

The defense mounted a vigorous challenge to the State's case, but in view of the prosecution's evidence, the jury's verdict was unimpeachable.

2. The Evidence at Trial

Hae Min Lee's decomposing body was found on February 9, 1999, nearly four weeks after she vanished from Woodlawn High School. (T. 2/23/00 at 4). On February 12, 1999, an anonymous caller encouraged police to concentrate on Adnan Syed; the caller also gave police the name, high school, and home phone number of a friend of Syed's. (T. 2/24/00 at 58-60). According to the caller, Syed had told this friend that if he (Syed) ever hurt his girlfriend he

would drive her car into a lake. (*Id.*). Police traced the home number provided by the caller to one of Syed's closest friends, Yasser Ali. According to Syed's cell phone records, Ali received two calls from Syed's cell phone on the night of the murder. (*Id.* at 60; State's Exhibit 34; T. 2/3/00 at 79-83). Although police originally considered other suspects, particularly Alonzo Sellers (the person who came across the body in Leakin Park), the evidence uniformly converged on Syed beginning with the tip provided by the anonymous caller. (*See* State's Exhibit 29; T. 2/1/00 at 71-75; T. 1/31/00 at 10-11; T. 2/24/2000 at 21-26, 58-60, 71-72; T. 2/17/00 at 226-31).

Ensnared in a relationship complicated by culture and custom, Syed and Lee were nevertheless consumed with one another. (T. 2/3/00 at 85-87; T. 1/28/00 at 140-43; T. 2/16/00 at 299, 309). At the same time, to friends and in her diary, Lee described Syed as possessive, jealous, and overprotective. (T. 2/17/00 at 136-37; State's Exhibit 2). When police executed a search warrant at Syed's residence, they found a November 1998 letter from Lee tucked into a textbook, in which Lee sought to reassure Syed that they would both survive a breakup: "Your life is NOT going to end. You'll move on and I'll move on. But, apparently you don't respect me enough to accept my decision . . . I NEVER wanted to end like this, so hostile + cold. Hate me if you will. But you should remember that I could never hate you." (T. 1/27/00 at 184-86; State's Exhibit 38). Syed's apparent answer was scrawled on the back: "I'm going to kill." (State's Exhibit 38).

By December 1998, Lee felt compelled to keep her growing interest in Cliendinst a secret from Syed, concerned he would never forgive her. (State's Exhibit 2). Her anxieties were not without basis. Syed had told a classmate, Deborah Warren, that he was convinced Lee was having a relationship with Cliendinst while she was still involved with him. (T. 2/16/00 at 301-03). Syed was reassured by Warren at the time, but by the week of the murder, as Warren testified and Cliendinst confirmed, Lee had spent the night with Cliendinst. (T. 2/16/00 at 304; T. 2/1/00 at 88). And by then teachers and classmates alike knew of the relationship. (T. 1/28/00 at 145, 250; T. 2/4/00 at 12; T. 2/16/00 at 304).

During the trial, the State also proved the steps Syed took in the 24 hours before he killed Lee. On a newly-acquired cell phone, which was activated a day before the murder, Syed called Wilds to determine if he was available the next day. (T. 2/4/00 at 119; State's Exhibit 34). That same evening, after talking with Wilds, Syed attempted to call Hae Min Lee three times just before and after midnight. (State's Exhibit 34). During the third call, Syed gave Lee his new number, which she scribbled in the margin of her diary on the same page where she wrote "Don" 166 times. (State's Exhibit 2). Opposite this page is Lee's last diary entry, dated January 12, the night before she was killed: "I love you, Don. I think I have found my soul mate. I love you so much." (*Id.*).

Syed's first call the next morning was to Wilds, whom Syed then left school to pick up. (T. 2/4/00 at 121-23; State's Exhibit 34). While driving, Syed told Wilds about how hurt he was by Lee's treatment of him, how mad she made him, and said to Wilds, "I'm going to kill that bitch." (T. 2/4/00 at 125). Wilds — who pled guilty to being an accessory to the murder and agreed to take the stand for the State — testified that Syed left him his cell phone and car, instructing him to be ready to retrieve Syed when he called. (T. 2/4/00 at 125-26).

In addition, Crystal Myers, a mutual friend of Syed and Lee, testified about a conversation she had with Syed at school on the day Lee was killed. Syed told her that Lee was supposed to drive him after school to pick up his car, either from the repair shop or from Syed's brother. (T. 1/28/00 at 209). Syed similarly advised Officer Scott Adcock — who called Syed on January 13 after Lee was reported missing — that he was supposed to get a ride home from Lee, but that he was delayed and assumed Lee had left by the time he was ready. (T. 1/31/00 at 8). Two weeks later, on February 1, Syed retracted these statements when Officer Joseph O'Shea confronted him with what he had said to Officer Adcock. This time, contradicting what Syed had told Myers (*i.e.*, that Lee was going to give him a ride to pick up his car) and what he told Officer Adcock (*i.e.*, that Lee was supposed to give him a ride home), Syed stated that he would not have needed a ride from Lee since he had his own car. (T. 1/31/00 at 27).

But not only did Syed eventually disavow any plans to get a ride after school from Lee; he also shifted from telling Officer O'Shea, on the one hand, that he went to track practice after last seeing Lee during the final class period of the day to, on the other hand, feigning that he had no memory at all of the day his ex-girlfriend vanished when asked by the lead homicide detective a month later. (*Id.* at 25-26).

The jury learned from Wilds and other witnesses that all of Syed's vacillating accounts were untrue. After school ended, Wilds received a call from Syed who directed him to the Best Buy store on Security Boulevard. (T. 2/4/00 at 130). Parked to the side of the building was Lee's gray Sentra. After repeatedly asking Wilds if he was "ready for this," Syed opened the trunk and revealed the dead body of Hae Min Lee. (*Id.* at 131).

Wilds testified that over the next few hours he and Syed alternated between driving around in search of marijuana, attempting to establish an alibi for Syed, and disposing of the body. (*Id.* at 132-57). They initially moved Lee's car, with her body still inside, to the Park & Ride at Interstate 70 and Security Boulevard, just west of Leakin Park. (*Id.* at 132). Wilds later dropped Syed off at track practice at the high school so that Syed could be "seen," only to return a short time later to pick him up. (*Id.* at 142, 144).

Both men then proceeded to the home of Kristi Vincent. (*Id.* at 144). Around that time, Syed received phone calls from the victim's brother, Young Lee, and Officer Adcock, asking if Syed knew where his ex-girlfriend was. (*Id.* at 145).¹ After one of the calls, Syed abruptly motioned to Wilds that it was time to leave. (*Id.* at 146-47).

Wilds testified that, afterwards, Syed convinced him to help dispose of the body. (*Id.* at 147). Wilds told the jury that he dealt drugs, that he lived with his grandmother, and that he did not want trouble for her. (*Id.*) So he joined Syed who had secured two shovels and returned to the Park & Ride to retrieve Lee's car. (*Id.* at 147-48). They settled on dumping the body in

¹ It was during this call with Officer Adcock that Syed said that he had expected to get a ride from Lee after school that day, but that he had been delayed. (T. 1/31/00 at 8).

Leakin Park, where they went to an area a distance off the road and started digging Lee's grave. (*Id.* at 148-50). Wilds estimated it was around 7 p.m.; a little earlier, Wilds had used Syed's cell phone to page a friend of his, Jennifer Pusateri, to alert her that they would not be meeting up as they had previously planned. (*Id.* at 149-50). While Syed and Wilds were at Leakin Park, Pusateri returned the page, calling Syed's phone in order to speak to Wilds. (*Id.* at 151). Syed answered and told Pusateri that Wilds was busy, but that he would call her back later. (*Id.*)

After the makeshift grave was prepared, Syed and Wilds returned the shovels to Syed's car. (*Id.* at 153). Wilds told the jury that he refused to help move Lee's body from the trunk of her car, so Syed transported the corpse to the grave site by himself and "started to throw dirt on her head." (*Id.* at 151-52). For Syed and Wilds, there were points during the burial at Leakin Park where both men seemed disturbed and disoriented by the gravity of the moment. (*Id.*)

They left the city park as they had arrived, Syed operating his victim's car and Wilds driving Syed's. (*Id.* at 154). After trailing one another for a time, Syed eventually abandoned Lee's vehicle behind apartments and returned to his own car, which until then Wilds had driven. (*Id.*) They then proceeded to Westview Mall, where they discarded the shovels and where Pusateri recalled joining the two of them a little later. (*Id.* at 156-57).

During the course of that fateful night, Syed detailed, reflected on, and bragged to Wilds about what he had done. Syed reported that during the struggle Lee had kicked off the car's turn signal and had attempted to apologize to him. (*Id.* at 142). He told Wilds that killing Lee "kind of hurt him," but that when someone treated him the way she had, that person deserved to die (*Id.*); Syed later added that the murder, "kind of makes [me] feel better and then again it doesn't." (*Id.* at 156). Syed also derived a measure of pride in the method of the murder: "motherfuckers think they are hard, I killed somebody with my bare hands." (*Id.* at 142).

The State called additional witnesses who fortified key facts and critical features of the narrative and timeline established by the State at trial. For example, Nisha Tanna, a friend of Syed's, claimed she remembered receiving a call from Syed who, conspicuously, then placed Wilds on the phone, just as Wilds testified. (*Id.* at 136-37; T. 1/28/00 at 189-90). Syed's cell

phone records also confirmed two calls to Tanna on January 13 during the time Syed and Wilds were together. (State's Exhibit 34).

Kristi Vincent also observed Syed and Wilds together the evening of the murder. Vincent told the jury, consistent with Wilds' testimony, that Wilds arrived at her apartment with Syed, whom she had never met and whom Wilds never introduced, at around 6 p.m. (T. 2/16/00 at 209-215, 225-33; T. 2/4/00 at 144). She recalled the episode because both men were acting "real shady," and she noticed that Syed seemed to be hiding his face. (T. 2/16/00 at 237-39). Syed and Wilds left abruptly after Syed answered a call on his cell phone and said to the caller, "they're going to come talk to me . . . what should I say, what should I do?" (*Id.* at 213-14).

Also significant at trial was the testimony of Pusateri. She first came to the attention of police when — soon after the anonymous caller identified Syed as a suspect — police traced to Pusateri's address a phone number that had multiple contacts with Syed's cell phone on the day of the murder. (T. 2/17/00 at 154-55, 159). Pusateri first met with detectives on February 26, 1999 (*Id.*); she told them she had heard that Lee had been strangled, a fact that had not been released to the public. (*Id.* at 314-15). Pusateri also encouraged police, at Wilds' suggestion, that they should talk with Wilds. (*See* T. 2/15/00 at 204). The next day, unsolicited, Pusateri returned to police headquarters along with her mother and an attorney; she then outlined for detectives what she had learned from Wilds on the very night of the murder. (*Id.* at 202-03).

At trial, Pusateri reinforced crucial elements of the State's case. She corroborated, for instance, Wilds' testimony with respect to the afternoon, stating that Wilds had been at her home playing video games, waiting for a phone call. (*Id.* at 186-87). She explained that she later received a page from Wilds from an unknown number; when Pusateri called back, someone besides Wilds answered and said that Wilds was busy and would return her call when he was ready to be picked up. (*Id.* at 188-90). A short time later, Wilds paged Pusateri, asking her to meet him at Westview Mall. (*Id.* at 191-92). She testified that, when she arrived, Syed and Wilds pulled up in a car driven by Syed. (*Id.* at 194). Soon after Wilds got into Pusateri's car, he

confided in her that Syed had strangled Lee in the Best Buy parking lot and urged her not to tell anyone. (*Id.* at 195-96). Pusateri added that they later returned to Westview Mall, so that Wilds could make sure there were no prints on the shovels they had left behind. (*Id.* at 196).

The testimony of witnesses familiar with Syed, Lee, and the events of January 13 were one component of the State's case. Also persuasive was the prosecution's presentation of phone records and location data derived from the calls Syed and Wilds made in the hours before and after the murder. For one thing, the timing of calls to Hae Min Lee the night before her murder, as well as calls to Jay Wilds, Jennifer Pusateri, Nisha Tanna, and Yasser Ali on the day of the murder, reinforced the testimony of the State's witnesses and the prosecution's theory of what happened when and why.

The State's expert witness, Abraham Waranowitz, also plotted the location of cell towers corresponding to each call Syed and Wilds made that day. In order to validate this information, the expert actually visited locations where a call was supposedly made and initiated a test call to determine what tower the call engaged. (T. 2/8/00 at 83). For example, Waranowitz made three calls from the 4700 block of Gateway Terrace and found that two cell towers had strong signals on that street — those two towers coincided with the three calls on Syed's cell phone between 6 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. when Syed and Wilds were at Kristi Vincent's apartment, which was located at 4703 Gateway Terrace. (*Id.* at 96-97; State's Exhibit 34). The State's expert similarly confirmed that the two calls just after 7 p.m. — when Wilds placed himself and Syed at Leakin Park — connected to a tower at 2121 Windsor Garden Lane, due north of the spot where Syed buried Lee's body. (T. 2/8/00 at 97-98; State's Exhibit 34).

Furthermore, the State established that Syed's palm print was on the back cover of a map book inside Lee's car and that a page showing Leakin Park was torn from that book; the standalone page was also recovered from the middle of the back seat of Lee's car, where it could be reached from the driver's seat. (T. 1/31/00 at 58-60, 118-119; T. 2/1/00 at 24-29). The State also showed that the wiper lever inside of Lee's car was broken, which was consistent with

Wilds' testimony that Syed described Lee kicking as he strangled her in the front seat of the car. (State's Exhibit 6; T. 2/25/00 at 50).

Also illuminating was Syed's conduct in the weeks following the murder. Some at Woodlawn High School were concerned about Lee's whereabouts. Hope Schab, a teacher at Woodlawn, worked with detectives to ask for information and distributed written questions within the high school community. (T. 1/28/00 at 146-48). Not only did Syed decline to participate in these efforts, he affirmatively sought to thwart them, especially once he learned that he was a subject of interest. Schab testified that Syed asked her to stop raising questions about him; he claimed to Schab that he was concerned his parents would learn too much about his personal life. (T. 1/28/00 at 149). Similarly, Deborah Warren told the jury that Syed once borrowed her journal, but that when he returned it, all the papers inside were gone, including one with questions about him and Lee. (T. 2/16/00 at 317). Syed also elected not to attend the memorial service for Lee, telling Inez Hendricks, another teacher at Woodlawn, that he skipped the service because he and Lee practiced different religions. (T. 2/4/00 at 24-25). Also curious, although Syed regularly called Lee in the days, weeks, and months before her disappearance (including three times around midnight on January 13), between when Syed learned Lee was missing and when her body was discovered in Leakin Park, Syed never attempted to contact her. Not once. (*See* T. 10/25/12 at 57-59; State's Exhibit 34).

B. The Petition for Post-Conviction Relief

On May 28, 2010, ten years after he was sentenced and seven years after his direct appeal ended, Syed filed a petition for post-conviction relief, which was supplemented on June 27, 2011. The petition, as amended, raised, *inter alia*, two claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. First, Syed asserted that his trial attorney, Christina Gutierrez, was ineffective for failing to investigate and call to testify a supposed alibi witness, Asia McClain. (T. 11/29/10 at 5-6; T. 10/11/12 at 5-8). Second, Syed claimed he asked Gutierrez to approach the State about a plea deal and she failed to do so. (*Id.*). To support these claims, defense counsel called to testify five witnesses at the post-conviction hearing: Kevin Urick (one of the original prosecutors who tried

the case), Rabia Chaudry (Syed's close friend), Shamin Rahman (Syed's mother), Margaret Meade (admitted as an expert in criminal defense in Baltimore City), and Syed himself.

Gutierrez died in 2004. (T. 11/29/10 at 5). At the time when Syed retained her, however, she was a renowned criminal defense attorney who was hired because Syed and his family wanted to obtain an outright acquittal. (T. 10/11/12 at 84, 98-100; T. 10/25/12 at 98, 113). Prior to trial, Syed was represented by two prominent attorneys, both law professors today, Michael Millemann and Douglas Colbert. (T. 10/11/12 at 98-99; T. 10/25/12 at 8). Gutierrez was selected in part on the strength of Millemann's and Colbert's endorsement of her; Syed's mosque also screened candidates and conducted interviews of three attorneys, before deciding that Gutierrez was the best choice. (T. 10/11/12 at 84-85, 98-99). Syed's mother testified that Gutierrez was hired because "she had a reputation for being very tough," an "extensive background in trying criminal cases," and was known for "fighting very hard for the client." (*Id.* at 98-99).

Gutierrez was so coveted by Syed that, in fact, Syed fervently opposed the State's motion to remove her as his attorney. The State had requested disqualification on the ground that she already represented two grand jury witnesses, Balail Ahmed and Saad Chaudry, who might testify against Syed at trial. (T. 7/9/99). Millemann represented Syed in these proceedings and argued that Syed was entitled to the counsel of his choice. (*Id.*). Following the hearing, Syed wrote a long letter to the court, pleading with the judge to permit him to keep Gutierrez because of the strong personal and professional bond between them:

Professionally, M. Gutierrez's reputation proceeds [sic] her. Her presentations in court are remarkable, as is her success rate. Personally, she has a warm, caring, even motherly atmosphere that offers me a great deal of comfort. It is not her winning record, however, that compels me to retain her. It is her hardwork, determination & belief in my innocence that assures I am in the best hands.

(Apx. 1). Later that month, the court denied the State's motion. (*See* T. 7/23/99).

1. The Pursuit of an Alibi

In preparation for trial in Syed's case, Gutierrez assembled a team consisting of a private investigator and law clerks to assist with the pretrial investigation. (T. 10/25/12 at 8-32). Fashioning an alibi for Syed's whereabouts that supported Syed's statements to police was a clear priority for Gutierrez. (Apx. 2-3). In fact, Gutierrez, aware that Maryland rules required her to disclose potential alibi witnesses in advance of trial so that the State would have an opportunity to investigate the basis of the alibi, provided to the State a list of 80 potential alibi witnesses on October 5, 1999. (Apx. 2-3). According to the alibi notice:

These witnesses will be used to support the defendant's alibi as follows: On January 13, 1999, Adnan Masud Syed attended Woodlawn High School for the duration of the school day. At the conclusion of the school day, the defendant remained at the high school until the beginning of track practice. After track practice, Adnan Syed went home and remained there until attending services at his mosque that evening. These witnesses will testify to [sic] as to the defendant's regular attendance at school, track practice, and the Mosque; and that his absence on January 13, 1999 would have been missed.

(Apx. 2-3). Because Syed had spoken to police on multiple occasions before he was charged and before he retained counsel, the alibi framed in Gutierrez's notice to the State had the advantage of comports with what Syed had already said to law enforcement. (T. 1/31/00 at 5-14, 25-39; T. 2/17/00 at 256-73; T. 2/18/00 at 191-94).

Gutierrez also pursued an alibi defense at trial, through subtle cross-examination of witnesses presented by the State (*See, e.g.*, T. 2/4/00 at 97-100; T. 2/3/00 at 88-133), by substantiating a reliable routine that Syed followed every day, *i.e.*, attendance at school followed by track practice followed by services at the mosque (T. 2/23/00 at 79-81, 100-04, 274-75; T. 2/24/00 at 16-17, 116-17, 151, 185, 193-96), and by calling to testify for a specific alibi Syed's father, a credible and sympathetic figure who asserted that on the evening of Lee's disappearance he went to the mosque with his son at approximately 7:30 p.m. for an 8 p.m. prayer meeting (T. 2/24/00 at 16). Importantly, the trial court agreed to give an alibi instruction to the jury, thus

finding that an alibi defense had been generated by the facts established by Gutierrez at trial. (T. 2/25/00 at 32-33).

2. The Purported Alibi of Asia McClain

Notwithstanding Gutierrez's extensive pretrial investigation and efforts during trial, Syed now claims that Gutierrez was constitutionally ineffective for her alleged failure to adequately investigate one additional alibi witness, Asia McClain. (Appellant's Brief at 1).

Asia McClain was a fellow student at Woodlawn High School. (T. 10/11/12 at 5). After Syed's arrest, McClain sent Syed two letters, dated March 1, 1999, and March 2, 1999, requesting to talk with him to explore the relevance of a conversation McClain recalls having on January 13, 1999, at the nearby public library. (Defense P.C. Exhibits 6 & 7). She does not say in this set of correspondence why she remembers that day or what precisely she recalls. (*Id.*). Both letters express hope that Syed is innocent and simultaneously relay concerns that he is not: "I want you to look into my eyes and tell me of your innocence. If I ever find otherwise I will hunt you down and wip [sic] your ass . . . I hope that you're not guilty and I hope to death that you have nothing to do with it. If so I will try my best to help you account for some of your unwitnessed, unaccountable lost time (2:15-8:00)" (Defense P.C. Exhibit 7); "The information that I know about you being in the library could helpful [sic], unimportant or unhelpful to your case. . . . I guess that inside I know that you're innocent too. It's just that the so-called evidence looks very negative." (Defense P.C. Exhibit 6). In neither letter does McClain specify a particular time when she saw Syed at the library. (Defense P.C. Exhibits 6 & 7). She notes however that she aspires to become a criminal psychologist for the FBI. (Defense P.C. Exhibit 6).

Syed presented evidence to the post-conviction court that he made his defense team aware of these two original letters. To corroborate this, he referred to the notes of one of Gutierrez's law clerks, which suggest that McClain was discussed at a meeting between Syed and the clerk. (T. 10/25/12 at 4-5). Syed testified at the post-conviction hearing that he was "fairly certain" that his presence at the public library would have been to access his email account. (*Id.*

at 30-32). Consistent with this, Syed's email username and password are contained in the same section of the clerk's notes. (Defense P.C. Exhibit 5). In addition, Syed testified that he personally asked Gutierrez if she had looked into the McClain alibi angle. (T. 10/25/12 at 33-34, 38-39). Syed acknowledged that Gutierrez advised him that she had "looked into it and nothing came of it." (T. 10/25/12 at 33).

Syed also introduced an affidavit McClain signed a year later, on March 25, 2000, in which McClain claimed she saw Syed at a specific time at the library on the day of Lee's murder, and that she was never contacted by Syed's defense team. (T. 10/11/12 at 57-60; Defense P.C. Exhibit 2). This affidavit, signed a month after Syed was convicted, was prepared in the presence of Rabia Chaudry, a close family friend of Syed's and a law student at the time. (Defense P.C. Exhibit 2). In this post-trial affidavit, McClain recalled with pinpoint accuracy that she had waited for her boyfriend at 2:20 p.m., that she held a 15-20 minute conversation with Syed, and then left at about 2:40 p.m. (*Id.*). Nothing in the affidavit explained why McClain was now able to provide a concrete, narrow alibi for Syed when details like this were notably absent from her original letters to Syed. (*Id.*). Whatever the reason, the times neatly coincided with the State's postulation at Syed's trial as to when Syed may have killed Hae Min Lee. (*Id.*).

At the hearing, Chaudry stated that she spoke to Syed on multiple occasions by phone from the time of his arrest and throughout both trials; she attended most of the second trial and participated in two meetings between Gutierrez and Syed's parents. (T. 10/12/12 at 33-78). Chaudry claimed, however, that it was not until after Syed was convicted that she asked him to account for his whereabouts at the time of the murder. (*Id.* at 43-44, 76). According to Chaudry, Syed told her that, "it was like any other day for me," and that he had no specific memory of speaking to McClain (or anyone else at the library) that day. (*Id.*).

Kevin Urick, one of the original prosecutors, testified that McClain called him after the post-conviction was filed to say she had written the affidavit only because of pressure from the defendant's family and hoped that, by doing so, they would leave her alone. (T. 10/11/12 at 30). She expressed to Urick concerns about participating in the post-conviction hearing, and

ultimately she did not testify. (*Id.*) Urick's characterization of McClain's reticence is confirmed by Syed's present counsel who said that although he tried to produce McClain, she evaded service of the defense subpoena. (T. 10/25/12 at 106).

For his part, Syed testified at the post-conviction hearing that he received the letters from McClain within a week of his arrest and that the letters "fortified" the memory that he had of going to the library after school and staying there from 2:40 p.m. to 3 p.m. (*Id.* at 26-28). He further stated that he remembers exactly who he spoke with and what they spoke about. (*Id.* at 29). Syed's sharpened recollection nearly 14 years after the murder stood in contrast to the statements he gave police in the early days of the investigation and contradicted Chaudry's testimony of his statements to her that, even after he was convicted of murder, he had no memory of where he was after school on January 13, 1999.

C. The Denial of Post-Conviction Relief

The post-conviction court diligently considered and flatly dismissed, with detailed factual findings, Syed's claim that Gutierrez acted deficiently with respect to Asia McClain. First, the court concluded that "the letters sent from Ms. McClain to Petitioner do not clearly show Ms. McClain's potential to provide a reliable alibi witness." (App. 11):

In the first letter, sent on March 1, 1999, Ms. McClain recounted that she saw Petitioner in the public library on January 13, 1999, but did not state the exact time during which the encounter took place. Defense Post-Conviction Exhibit 7. The only indication of Ms. McClain's potential to be an alibi witness for Petitioner is in Ms. McClain's offer to "account for some of [Petitioner's] un-witnessed, unaccountable lost time (2:15 - 8:00; Jan 13th)." *Id.* In the letter sent on March 2, 1999, the following day, Ms. McClain again told Petitioner that she saw the Petitioner in the public library on January 13th and conjectured, "maybe if I would have stayed with you or something this entire situation could have been avoided." Defense Post-Conviction Exhibit 6. To require counsel to interpret such vague language as evidence of a concrete alibi would hold counsel to a much higher standard than is required by *Strickland*. In addition, trial counsel could have reasonably concluded that Ms. McClain was offering to lie in order to help Petitioner avoid conviction.

(App. 11-12).

The Honorable Judge Martin P. Welch also determined that, since neither McClain nor any other purported alibi witness testified at the hearing, Syed had failed to substantiate his claim of ineffective assistance of counsel: “In *Veney v. Warden*, the Court denied relief to a defendant who failed to call an alibi witness on post-conviction and instead, made a proffer that the witness’ trial testimony would have supported the defendant’s alleged alibi. *Veney v. Warden*, 259 Md. 437, 450 (1970).” (App. 9).

Moreover, the post-conviction court found that Gutierrez did in fact conduct a substantial investigation and developed a potential alibi theory on Syed’s behalf:

Trial counsel identified more than eighty (80) potential alibi witnesses prior to Petitioner’s trial. State Post-Conviction Exhibit 1. Trial counsel also noted how each witness could be used to support Petitioner’s own stated alibi; that he had remained at school from 2:15 p.m. until track practice at 3:30 p.m. on the day of the murder. *Id.*

(App. 9).

The court also found as fact that the information supplied by McClain contradicted the version of the events Syed relayed to the police and presumably to his defense team:

Secondly, the information in Ms. McClain’s letters stating the Petitioner was present at the public library contradicted Petitioner’s own version of the events of January 13th, namely Petitioner’s own stated alibi that he remained on the school campus from 2:15 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Based on this inconsistency, trial counsel had adequate reason to believe that pursuing Ms. McClain as a potential alibi witness would not have been helpful to Petitioner’s defense and may have, in fact, harmed the defense’s theory of the case.

(App. 12).

The post-conviction court also rejected Syed’s contention that Gutierrez was constitutionally deficient for failing to seek a plea offer that Syed claimed he requested. The undisputed evidence before the post-conviction court was that Syed had always maintained his innocence. (App. 16; T. 10/25/12 at 56). In part because of this, no plea discussions took place. (T. 10/25/12 at 108-10). Moreover, the post-conviction court made a factual determination that there was “nothing in the record indicating that the State was prepared to make a plea offer had

trial counsel pursued such negotiations. In fact, Petitioner has provided no convincing evidence that a plea offer was even contemplated or discussed by the State.” (App. 15).

The only evidence before the post-conviction court that Syed ever asked Gutierrez to seek a plea deal was Syed’s testimony, which was not credited by the court. In fact, the court found “that Petitioner intended to maintain his innocence throughout.” (App. 16). Lacking any credible evidence to support Syed’s assertion that he had sought a plea, Judge Welch ruled that Syed had failed to prove that Gutierrez had violated his Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel. (App. 16).

The post-conviction court’s factual finding that Syed “intended to maintain his innocence throughout” was also dispositive with respect to prejudice. Because there was no reliable evidence that Syed would have entered a guilty plea under any circumstances, the court determined that Syed had not established what harm he had suffered. Ultimately, Judge Welch concluded, “trial counsel’s failure to initiate plea negotiations was not a deficient act and did not prejudice Petitioner.” (App. 16).

ARGUMENT

Syed contends that the post-conviction court erred in denying his claims that Gutierrez was ineffective. (*See* Appellant’s Brief). Sixth Amendment claims of ineffective assistance of counsel are evaluated under the Supreme Court’s decision in *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984). *Kulbicki v. State*, 440 Md. 33, 46 (2014). In order to prevail, a criminal defendant must show (1) that counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and (2) that counsel’s deficient performance resulted in prejudice to the defendant. *See Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 687; *Kulbicki*, 440 Md. at 46. The reviewing court “must judge the reasonableness of counsel’s challenged conduct on the facts of the particular case, viewed as of the time of counsel’s conduct.” *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 690. The reviewing court’s scrutiny of counsel’s conduct “must be highly deferential.” *Id.* at 689. The court “must indulge a strong presumption that counsel’s conduct falls within the wide range of reasonable professional assistance,” as “[t]here are countless ways to provide effective assistance in any

given case” and “[e]ven the best criminal defense attorneys would not defend a particular client in the same way.” *Id.* Thus, “[a] fair assessment of attorney performance requires that every effort be made to eliminate the distorting effects of hindsight, to reconstruct the circumstances of counsel’s challenged conduct, and to evaluate the conduct from counsel’s perspective at the time.” *Id.* To succeed, the defendant “must overcome the presumption that, under the circumstances, the challenged action ‘might be considered sound trial strategy.’” *Id.* (quoting *Michel v. Louisiana*, 350 U.S. 91, 101 (1955)).

Additionally, even where a court finds an error of constitutional dimension, “[t]he defendant must show that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different.” *Id.* at 694. Furthermore, whereas “[a] reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome,” *id.* at 694, “[i]t is not enough for the defendant to show that the errors had some conceivable effect on the outcome of the proceeding,” *id.* at 693. “The benchmark for judging any claim of ineffectiveness must be whether counsel’s conduct so undermined the proper functioning of the adversarial process that the trial cannot be relied on as having a just result.” *Id.* at 686.

Whether counsel’s representation has been constitutionally inadequate is a mixed question of law and fact: “As a question of whether a constitutional right has been violated, we make our own independent evaluation by reviewing the law and applying it to the facts of the case. We will not, however, disturb the findings of fact and credibility determinations of the post-conviction court, unless they are clearly erroneous.” *State v. Purvey*, 129 Md. App. 1, 10-11 (1999) (citations omitted); *State v. Latham*, 182 Md. App. 597, 613 (2008).

I.

THE COURT RIGHTLY REJECTED SYED’S CLAIM THAT COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO ASIA MCCLAIN.

Syed asserts that Gutierrez was ineffective because she failed to investigate, and possibly call in defense, Asia McClain, a purported alibi witness. (Appellant’s Brief at 14-24). He claims

that the failure to investigate McClain deprived him of a defense, and that had McClain been investigated, there is a reasonable probability that the result of the trial would have been different. (*Id.*).

Syed's claim is meritless. Gutierrez presented to the State a list of 80 alibi witnesses that she developed and reserved the right to call in defense. The anticipated testimony of those witnesses squared with what Syed had already told police. The post-conviction court rightly held, in contrast, that McClain's nebulous correspondence did not warrant serious attention. Where Gutierrez, a diligent and experienced trial attorney, developed an alibi theory based on Syed's usual routine, a court should not revisit an attorney's judgment to adhere to one alibi theory instead of pursuing another. In addition, because Syed did not produce McClain at the post-conviction hearing, Syed failed, both as a matter of law and on the facts of this case, to establish prejudice. Accordingly, the post-conviction court properly denied this claim for relief.

A. Syed failed to establish that Gutierrez' strategy and judgment with respect to an alibi defense based upon Asia McClaine was constitutionally deficient.

The post-conviction court reasonably concluded that the purported alibi that McClain offered to provide was vague and unreliable. As the court found, the letters written by McClain were vague and did not provide Syed with a concrete promise of a specific alibi. Indeed, at the bottom of the second page of the March 1, 1999, letter, McClain openly qualifies her information when she states: "If you were in the library for awhile, tell the police and I'll continue to tell what I know even louder than I am." (emphasis added). This indicates that McClain may have been guessing about Syed's presence in the library, or that her recollection was mistaken if not fabricated. This conclusion is consistent with Urick's post-conviction testimony that McClain told him she was pressured by Syed's family into drafting and signing an affidavit confirming the content of the earlier letters and specifying a time that was not contained in the original correspondence. (T. 10/11/12 at 30).

The court also correctly determined that Syed did not establish a failure to perform by Gutierrez with respect to investigating Asia McClain. Even assuming *arguendo* that McClain's offer of an alibi warranted some attention, Syed bears the burden of proving that Gutierrez failed to do so. Syed elected not to call any member of the defense team and was unable to secure McClain's testimony at the post-conviction hearing. What remains is a dubious affidavit prepared long ago by McClain that, according to Urick's testimony, was generated as a result of pressure from Syed's family in the wake of Syed's conviction at trial. The court below rightly found that this was insufficient to meet Syed's burden.

Moreover, Syed claimed that Gutierrez advised him that she had explored the McClain alibi and nothing had come of it. (T. 10/25/12 at 32-35, 38-39). Syed baldly insists that his counsel deceived him, but the post-conviction court had no evidence of this before it. Even if Syed relies upon McClain's affidavit (which states that she was not contacted by a member of Gutierrez's team), speaking to McClain is not the only way for Gutierrez to have assessed the value and veracity of the potential alibi. In fact, the evidence before the post-conviction makes clear that other methods of inspecting the potential alibi existed. After all, the law clerk's notes upon which Syed relied to show that the defense was aware of the McClain letters in the first place also reveal that, on the same date the McClain correspondence was discussed, the defense team obtained — presumably from Syed — his email account information and were made aware that the public library may have had surveillance cameras. (*See* Defense Post Conviction Exhibit 5). Syed himself indicated that he was "fairly certain" that use of his email account would have been the principal reason for this presence at the Woodlawn library between the end of school and the start of track practice. (T. 10/25/12 at 30-32). Thus, by simply entering the login and password scribbled on the law clerk's note, Gutierrez's team could have swiftly evaluated the potential alibi by determining whether Syed's email account had activity during the relevant timeframe. And where a seasoned defense attorney like Gutierrez generates a list of 80 potential

alibi witnesses, it is reasonable to conclude that some inspection of this 81st alibi witness was performed. For this reason too, Syed's claim of deficient performance failed.²

Likewise, the court correctly found that declining to pursue the McClain alibi may have been a sound exercise of strategic judgment. As the post-conviction court noted, the information contained in the McClain letters was not helpful to Syed because McClain's account contradicted the story Syed told the police regarding his whereabouts the day Lee disappeared. On January 25, 1999, Detective O'Shea contacted Syed, and Syed told O'Shea that he was at school all day and stayed until track practice began. (T. 1/31/00 at 5-14, 25-39). Presumably, Syed shared with Gutierrez this same information, and she was entitled to act accordingly. The extensive alibi notice filed with the court proves that she did so.³ See *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 691 (“[W]hen the facts that support a certain potential line of defense are generally known to counsel because of what the defendant has said, the need for further investigation may be considerably diminished or eliminated altogether.”).

Indeed, as the post-conviction court aptly recognized, this was not a case where there was no investigation into a potential alibi defense. (App. 9). Nor was this a case where Gutierrez botched the alibi notice requirements. Rather, the record reflects that through meetings with Syed and an extensive investigation of the case, the defense team compiled a list of 80 potential alibi witnesses that were available to combat the prosecution's case. (App. 9). Given the extent

² Syed repeatedly states that Gutierrez lied to him when she stated that nothing came of her investigation of McClain. (Appellant's Brief at 14-24). The claim is a bald assertion based solely on Syed's own self-serving testimony, which the post-conviction court generally did not credit.

³ Relying on *State v. Simms*, 420 Md. 705 (2011), and *Williams v. Florida*, 399 U.S. 78 (1970), Syed suggests on appeal that the alibi witness list was not evidence upon which the court should have relied. (Appellant's Brief at 22). The alibi witness list was admitted without objection, (T. 10/25/12 at 101-02), and was relevant to show the extent of the investigation conducted by Gutierrez, which Syed was challenging. Neither *Simms* nor *Williams* state that the alibi notice was not admissible for this purpose. Syed actually relied on the notice in his closing argument to the post-conviction court. (T. 10/25/12 at 104-05).

of this investigation, Gutierrez clearly had a basis upon which to conclude that McClain's information was either false, unreliable, immaterial, or harmful to the defense. In fact, there is no evidence in the record — at trial or in the post-conviction proceedings — that visiting the library to check email between school and track practice was part of the Syed's habitual pattern; accordingly, it would have been a conspicuous aberration from the daily routine that Gutierrez sought to establish. Also, at no point did Syed tell anyone that he deviated from his customary practice and went to the Woodlawn Public Library after school that day.

In light of these facts, the post-conviction court properly concluded that trial counsel's decision not to reflexively pursue McClain as a potential alibi witness was reasonable under the circumstances. See *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 690-91 (recognizing that when judging an allegation of ineffectiveness, a "court must . . . determine whether, in light of all the circumstances, the identified acts or omissions were outside the wide range of professionally competent assistance"); see also *State v. Lloyd*, 48 Md. App. 535, 540 (1981) ("[T]he decision whether to call a witness is ordinarily a matter of trial tactics within the discretion of defense counsel.")⁴

Syed's reliance on *Griffin v. Warden*, 970 F.2d 1355 (4th Cir. 1992), is misplaced. (Appellant's Brief at 23). Griffin's attorney expected his client to take a plea and therefore admitted that he did not contact any potential alibi witnesses in preparation for trial. In addition, the court in *Griffin* found that there was no strategic justification for this total failure to prepare a defense. *Griffin*, 970 F.2d at 1356-59.

⁴ Syed cites the American Bar Association Standard of Criminal Justice for the proposition that trial counsel must conduct a sufficient investigation of the case. (Appellant's Brief at 15). On the record before the post-conviction court, there is no doubt that Gutierrez more than satisfied this requirement. Also, the Maryland Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct forbid counsel from knowingly presenting to the court false facts or evidence. Md. Rule Prof. Resp. 3.3. See *Lloyd*, 48 Md. App. at 541 (recognizing that it is improper for defense counsel to call alibi witnesses when the attorney knows or is convinced that these witnesses will offer perjured testimony).

By contrast, here, there was ample evidence of proactive pursuit of an alibi defense, and there were serious risks to expanding that defense to include an unpredictable and potentially contradictory witness. Put simply, Gutierrez’s team assiduously developed 80 alibi witnesses that would conform to the account provided by Syed to police. To demand that a skilled and seasoned trial attorney like Christina Gutierrez abandon — or risk compromising — one alibi strategy to chase after another is inconsistent with the constitutional guarantee of effective counsel.

B. Syed also failed to establish prejudice.

1. Syed’s claim of ineffective assistance fails as a matter of law because Syed did not produce the supposed alibi witness at the post-conviction hearing.

Syed failed to produce McClain, the purported alibi witness, at the post-conviction hearing in support of his claim for a new trial. Rather, he attempted to prove his case by McClain’s two vague letters and by an “affidavit to Chaudry” that was over a dozen years old (Appellant’s Brief at 24).⁵ As the State argued below, Syed’s evidence was in a form incapable of being tested for reliability. (T. 10/11/12 at 11-12, 58-60; T. 10/25/12 at 119-20). In fact, particularly with respect to McClain’s purported “credibility,” (Appellant’s Brief at 20-21), Syed’s claim rests on nothing other than bald and speculative assertions.

The Court of Appeals has held that “a failure to call witnesses will only constitute a ground for post conviction relief where the petitioner produces the alleged witnesses in support of his claim that the denial was prejudicial to his right to a fair trial.” *Veney v. Warden*, 259 Md. 437, 450-51 (1970); *see also State v. Mahoney*, 16 Md. App. 193, 207 (1972) (recognizing that failure to present testimony of purported alibi witnesses at post-conviction hearing reduced the claim of prejudice to a mere “bald assertion”); *White v. Warden*, 1 Md. App. 670, 674 (1967) (“Failure of counsel to call witnesses may under some circumstances be a ground for

⁵ Syed stated that McClain “evaded service in Oregon. We could not produce her.” (T. 10/25/12 at 106).

post-conviction relief, but as the applicant was unable to produce the alleged witness, the claim has not been supported and must be denied.”). By failing to produce McClain at the post-conviction hearing, there was no showing that her testimony would have been helpful to the defense. Thus, Syed failed, as a matter of law, to prove that any failure by Gutierrez to investigate or call McClain as a witness prejudiced his right to a fair trial. The analysis of Syed’s ineffective assistance of counsel claim should end here. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 697 (“If it is easier to dispose of an ineffectiveness claim on the ground of lack of sufficient prejudice, which we expect will often be so, that course should be followed.”).

The cases cited by Syed do not compel a contrary result. Indeed, the relevant cases upon which Syed relies support the proposition that, in order to be entitled to post-conviction relief based on trial counsel’s failure to investigate alibi witnesses, the defendant must produce the witnesses at an evidentiary hearing before he can prove that he was prejudiced by their absence.⁶ See generally *Griffin*, 970 F.2d at 1357 (defendant’s purported alibi witnesses testified at state post-conviction hearing); *Grooms v. Solem*, 923 F.2d 88, 89-90 (8th Cir. 1991) (defendant’s purported alibi witnesses testified at state post-conviction hearing); *Tosh v. Lockhart*, 879 F.2d 412, 413-14 (8th Cir. 1989) (defendant’s purported alibi witnesses testified at federal evidentiary hearing); *Johns v. Perini*, 462 F.2d 1308, 1311 (6th Cir. 1972) (records corroborating defendant’s purported alibi presented at federal evidentiary hearing); *Montgomery v. Peterson*, 846 F.2d 407, 409 (7th Cir. 1988) (in state post-conviction proceedings, defendant introduced trial transcript of purported alibi witness’s testimony); *Code v. Montgomery*, 799 F.2d 1481, 1482 (11th Cir. 1986)

⁶ *In re Parris W.*, 363 Md. 717 (2001) is inapposite for two reasons. First, the defense attorney admitted that he had failed to subpoena witnesses for the correct date in the juvenile proceeding. Second, because the parties disagreed on whether post-conviction relief was available in the context of juvenile proceedings, and because the court found that the critical facts were not in dispute, the Court of Appeals permitted resolution of the issue on direct appeal; this represent a rare exception to the rule that ineffectiveness claims are resolved in post-conviction proceedings. Because this is a post-conviction appeal, *Veney* controls.

(defendant's purported alibi witnesses testified at federal evidentiary hearing). Having failed to do this, Syed failed to meet his burden of proof as to this claim.⁷

2. Nor can Syed establish prejudice where the State presented overwhelming evidence in support of the jury's verdict.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Syed met his burden of production with respect to the first prong of *Strickland*, his claim would still fail. The State did not present single threads of evidence to be judged one by one, but stitched together a durable fabric that could not be unraveled by a single stray witness. In fact, witnesses called by the State sometimes presented testimony that did not fit neatly into the State's timeline. Deborah Warren, for instance, told the jury that she saw the victim at about 3 p.m. near the high school gym. (T. 2/16/00 at 303). Syed's father testified on behalf of the defense that he and his son drove to their mosque at approximately 7:30 p.m., around the time when Syed and Wilds were at the gravesite at Leakin Park and were about to leave to dispose of Lee's car.

Even if Asia McClain had testified the way Syed and his family imagined she would, under the weight of crushing evidence presented by the State, Syed cannot credibly assert prejudice.⁸ Juries are expected during deliberations to wrestle with and ultimately reconcile the

⁷ Attached to Syed's supplement to application for leave to appeal is a statement signed by McClain on January 13, 2015, "under penalty of perjury," that contains troubling accusations. McClain also states a willingness to testify. McClain's January 13, 2015, affidavit obviously was not part of the proceedings below and should not be considered in this appeal. Nor should this case be remanded because of McClain's new affidavit.

⁸ The school day ended at Woodlawn High School at 2:15 p.m. on January 13, 1999. Syed's cell phone records for that day show two incoming calls from unidentified numbers at 2:36 p.m. (5 seconds long) and 3:15 p.m. (20 seconds long). At Syed's trial, prosecutors posited that the 2:36 p.m. entry corresponded to Syed's call to Wilds from the Best Buy store on Security Blvd., suggesting that the murder took place between 2:15 p.m. and 2:36 p.m. Asia McClain's affidavit from March 2000, prepared shortly after Syed was convicted on this timeline, avers that Syed was with her at the public library until 2:40 p.m., when she left. Accordingly, Syed claims that McClain's testimony would have been especially relevant to his alibi defense.

(continued...)

tensions that inexorably arise in the course of a trial. In complex criminal cases that unfold in the real world and are tried before real juries, these kinds of gaps and inconsistencies do not undermine the integrity and veracity of the jury's verdict.

II.

FAILING TO SEEK A PLEA WHERE NONE HAS BEEN OFFERED DOES NOT CONSTITUTE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.

Syed also challenges the post-conviction court's denial of his claim that Gutierrez failed to request a plea offer as he had instructed her to. (Appellant's Brief at 24-30). He argues that, upon his purported request to seek a plea offer, Gutierrez was constitutionally obligated to engage the prosecution in plea negotiations, and her failure to do so cost him the opportunity to choose between pleading guilty and going to trial. (*Id.*).

This Court should not extend for the first time the constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel to a defense attorney's judgment of whether to seek from the State a plea offer, particularly where the State did not offer a plea, nor is there any reason to think it would have. First, it would be odd to establish a constitutional obligation for a defense attorney to ask the State to extend a plea where the opposing party (*i.e.*, the State) has no corresponding

(...continued)

The problem with this logic is that the State could have worked off the (also tenable) assumption that it was the 20-second 3:15 p.m. call, not the earlier 2:36 p.m. entry, that corresponded to Syed's call to Wilds to come meet him. In other words, had McClain testified that she and Syed were sending emails or talking to one another at the Woodlawn library until 2:40 p.m., that would have presented a relevant alibi on only one of two possible timelines that the State could have argued to the jury. Both calls were short and originated from an unspecified number; either of them could have been presented by the State as the key communication from Syed to Wilds; and neither timeline was more or less consistent with the remainder of the State's case. To be clear, the point is not that the State's asserted timeline was flawed, but only that Syed overstates the significance of Asia McClain. At most, McClain would have, like Warren and Syed's father, added a modest wrinkle to the possible timelines of the crime. This too underscores why Syed has not established prejudice as a result of the alleged failure to pursue Asia McClain.

obligation to extend that offer. Second, for a court to enforce such a right and fashion a remedy would require the court to pile speculation upon speculation in order to determine what offer the State may have made, what offer the defendant may have accepted, and how those negotiations would have unfolded during the pendency of a criminal case. In addition, the facts of this case illustrate why Syed's argument, if accepted, would yield an unworkable precedent. As the post-conviction court found, Syed failed to establish that he desired a plea or that he affirmatively requested his attorney to ask for one. Syed also failed to establish that the State, charged with prosecuting the ruthless murder of a young girl where the State possessed overwhelming evidence, would have contemplated offering Syed any plea at all. Finally, even if this Court accepts that Syed asked Gutierrez to request a plea, Syed has failed to prove prejudice since there is no evidence that Syed was prepared to accept any deal that the State might have been willing to extend.

A. Failure to seek a plea offer from prosecutors when none has been offered is not a cognizable constitutional claim under the Sixth Amendment.

The Supreme Court has never recognized a defendant's right to a plea and the jurisprudence concerning plea negotiations manifestly does not support Syed's claim to ineffective counsel on this basis. In *Lafler v. Cooper*, 132 S. Ct. 1376 (2012), and *Missouri v. Frye*, 132 S. Ct. 1399 (2012), the Court recognized a right to effective counsel in the context of plea bargaining, but did not contemplate creating a duty to seek a plea when none has been offered.

Under the Supreme Court's reasoning, it is the prosecution's act of extending the formal plea offer that triggers the corresponding obligation for defense counsel to act in accordance with the Constitution. See *Frye*, 132 S. Ct. at 1408 (holding only that defense counsel has constitutional duty to communicate to defendant formal offers from prosecutors). The formal plea offer is the critical benchmark because "there is no constitutional right to a plea bargain; the prosecutor need not do so if [he or she] prefers to go to trial." *Weatherford v. Bursey*, 429 U.S. 545, 561 (1977). In other words, whether the defendant gets a "choice" to plead guilty in exchange for a reduced sentence or criminal charge is at the sole discretion of the prosecution

because defendants have “no right to be offered a plea.” *Lafler*, 132 S. Ct. at 1387 (quoting *Frye*, 132 S. Ct. at 1410). Thus, “[i]f no plea offer is made,” the issue of whether counsel was ineffective with respect to plea negotiations “simply does not arise.” *Id.*; see also *Williams v. State*, 326 Md. 367, 378 (1992) (“A trial attorney performs deficiently when he or she does not disclose to the client that the State has made a plea offer.”). It follows that the failure to pursue a plea bargain, by itself, is not enough to engage the ineffective assistance of counsel test. Indeed, this must be the case because, in the absence of formalized plea terms, it is difficult to fashion an appropriate remedy for the purported constitutional violation. *Cf. Lafler*, 132 S. Ct. at 1389 (describing remedial alternatives that apply where ineffective assistance of counsel results in the nonacceptance of a formal plea offer, both of which are defined by the offer’s terms).

B. Syed failed to prove that Gutierrez acted deficiently or that plea negotiations were viable for either Syed or the State.

Syed’s contention that Gutierrez acted deficiently by reporting to him that the State was not offering him a plea deal is unavailing. (*See* Appellant’s Brief). The only evidence supporting this claim is Syed’s own, self-serving post-conviction testimony, which the post-conviction court did not credit. (App. 15-16). Moreover, if Gutierrez reported to Syed that the State was not offering him a plea deal, that information was accurate. Based on the evidence presented at the post-conviction hearing, entering a guilty plea was not an option for Syed, regardless of whether Gutierrez affirmatively pursued that option on his behalf. Syed committed to proceed to trial and seek an acquittal, and he in fact never deviated from that position, maintaining his innocence even after he was convicted. (App. 16) (“In fact, Petitioner’s own statements at sentencing indicate the contrary; that Petitioner intended to maintain his innocence throughout.”) The post-conviction testimony of Syed’s mother is perhaps the best evidence of this — clearly Gutierrez was hired and paid substantial sums to obtain an acquittal, not a guilty plea. (T. 10/11/12 at 83-100).

Even assuming Syed raised a cognizable ineffective assistance of counsel claim, he still failed to establish that Gutierrez acted deficiently in the context of his case. The post-conviction

court found that Syed failed to show that the prosecution ever considered extending a plea offer in the case. (App. 15) (“In fact, Petitioner has provided no convincing evidence that a plea offer was even contemplated or discussed by the State.”). The post-conviction court also found that Syed failed to sustain his burden of proof that he would have agreed to enter a guilty plea. (App. 16). Both of these critical findings of fact are fully supported by the record and are not clearly erroneous.

In light of these facts, any attempt by trial counsel to engage the prosecution in plea negotiations certainly would have been a futile, if not counterproductive, effort. As one court has stated, “[l]awyers must take clients as they find them, and the client who persists in his protestation of innocence would scarcely welcome advice from his champion that would assure his incarceration. Put another way, it stretches common sense to impose on a lawyer the affirmative duty to canvass options which the lawyer knows are directly contrary to the client’s wishes.” *United States v. Gordon*, 979 F.Supp. 337, 341 (E.D. Pa. 1997). To be sure, defense counsel is not compelled to engage an unwilling prosecutor in plea negotiations solely for the purpose of reporting to a client unwilling to enter a guilty plea that no plea offer is forthcoming. Here, in light of Syed’s protestations of innocence and his desire to be vindicated at trial, Gutierrez had valid reasons not to engage the prosecution in plea negotiations. *See, e.g., Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 688-89 (emphasizing that Petitioner bears the burden of proving deficient conduct and reviewing court must give substantial deference to counsel’s strategic decisions).

The cases Syed cites to support his assertion of deficient conduct pre-date *Lafler* and *Frye*, the two Supreme Court decisions that clarified the constitutional obligations of counsel in this context, and generally do not support his claim for relief. *See Newman v. Vasbinder*, 259 F. App’x 851, 854 (6th Cir. 2008) (unpublished) (“We will not hold that an attorney rendered constitutionally deficient assistance because she did not seek a plea agreement that she reasonably believed the prosecutor would reject, and that could not be reconciled with her client’s version of the facts of the offense.”); *Freund v. Butterworth*, 165 F.3d 839, 880 (11th Cir. 1999) (proposition upon which Petitioner relies is from dissenting opinion where majority found

no ineffective assistance of counsel); *Mason v. Balcom*, 531 F.2d 717, 725 (5th Cir. 1976) (ineffective assistance found on “assembly-line nature” of representation, not failure to pursue plea negotiations); *Martin v. Rose*, 717 F.2d 295, 296 (6th Cir. 1983) (ineffective assistance premised principally on total failure of counsel to mount a defense as opposed to the failure to pursue plea negotiations); *Cole v. Slayton*, 378 F.Supp. 364, 368 (W.D. Va. 1974) (same).

Syed does not suggest, nor could he, that Gutierrez’s representation was a complete failure, and, indeed, the record establishes the opposite. Syed’s case was tried twice. At a pretrial hearing on January 10, 2000, the defense, with Syed present, specifically informed the court that, based on interviews of jurors following the first trial, the defense was confident in its case and ready to begin a second trial. (T. 1/10/00 at 33). Gutierrez thereafter presented a forceful defense to the State’s case in a trial that lasted six weeks. What the record shows is that Syed was satisfied with Gutierrez’s services until the jury returned an adverse verdict at the second trial, and then he waited ten years to claim that she was ineffective for failing to pursue a plea offer at his request. Because no deficient act was proven, the post-conviction court properly denied relief on this claim.

C. Syed failed to establish that this alleged ineffective counsel claim prejudiced the outcome of his criminal proceedings.

Syed failed to establish prejudice because he made no showing that the State would have considered a plea, nor was he entitled to one. As the Supreme Court stated in *Frye*,

[t]o show prejudice from ineffective assistance of counsel where a plea offer has lapsed or been rejected because of counsel’s deficient performance, defendants must demonstrate a reasonable probability they would have accepted the earlier plea offer had they been afforded effective assistance of counsel. Defendants must also demonstrate a reasonable probability the plea would have been entered without the prosecution canceling it or the trial court refusing to accept it, if they had the authority to exercise that discretion under state law. To establish prejudice in this instance, it is necessary to show a reasonable probability that the end result of the criminal process would have been more favorable by reason of a plea to a lesser charge or a sentence of less prison time.

Frye, 132 S. Ct. 1409 (citation omitted).

It is undisputed in this case that the State never extended a plea offer to Syed. (*See, e.g.*, T. 10/25/12 at 108-09, 126). It is also undisputed that the State never considered extending a plea offer to Syed. (*Id.*). There is therefore no evidence regarding a specific charge or sentence that Syed would have been offered or accepted. As a result, Syed failed to establish that, but for a deficient act by his trial counsel, his case would have ended in a plea to a lesser charge or a sentence of less prison time. *See, e.g., Aguilar v. Alexander*, 125 F.3d 815, 820-21 (9th Cir. 1997) (explaining that counsel was not deficient for failing to not further pursue a plea offer where there was no evidence that additional efforts would have resulted in the prosecution extending an offer).

Furthermore, there is also no proof that Syed would have entertained a plea offer that required him to serve time in prison. To the contrary, the post-conviction court, which observed Syed's testimony, found as fact that, at the time of trial, Syed was only interested in pursuing a full acquittal. (App. 15-16). This finding is not only consistent with the manner in which the case was defended, but also by Syed's own words. Syed cited Gutierrez's belief in his innocence when he personally urged the court to deny the State's motion to disqualify counsel. (Apx. 1). Even after being convicted, he reaffirmed his innocence:

Yes. Since the beginning I have maintained my innocence, and I don't know why people have said the things that they have said that I have done or that they have done. . . . I have maintained my innocence from the beginning, and to my family and to those who have believed in me since the beginning, I would just like to let them know it is for a reason.

(T. 6/6/00 at 15-16). Under the record before the post-conviction court, Syed's claim that he would have considered a plea offer in the case was not credible.⁹

⁹ Even if credible, Syed's testimony falls short of establishing a reasonable probability that he would have entered a guilty plea. In his post-conviction testimony, Syed only vaguely suggested he would have considered a plea offer that carried a sentence of "20 or 30 years" of (continued...)

D. Syed's "presumed prejudice" claim is unpreserved and meritless.

For the first time, Syed argues that this scenario warrants a "presumption of prejudice," a standard contrary to that articulated by *Strickland*. (*Id.*)¹⁰ Syed's claim, that his ineffective assistance of counsel claim fits within the small class of cases for which prejudice is presumed, (Appellant's Brief at 24-30), was not raised before the post-conviction court. Nor was it raised in Syed's application for leave to appeal, which was granted by this Court. Because the argument was not raised below or in Syed's application for leave to appeal, the argument is not preserved for appellate review. *See, e.g., White v. State*, 324 Md. 626, 640 (1991) (argument not made to trial court is not properly before appellate court) (citing Md. Rule 8-131(a)).¹¹

This argument fails in any event. None of the cases cited by Syed support the argument that defense counsel is ineffective per se by not engaging the prosecution in plea negotiations.

⁹(...continued)

which he would only have to serve half; he also has made clear that he would not have considered an offer that included a term of life in prison. (T. 10/25/12 at 47-48). Syed has never indicated that that he would have made a full confession to murdering Hae Min Lee, a precondition that the State and the victim's family would likely have insisted upon in a case like this. (*Id.*) Syed also testified that he followed Gutierrez's advice, and there is no evidence that she would have advised him to enter a guilty plea.

It should also be noted that, if Syed only desired a 20- or 30-year plea offer, imposing a constitutional requirement that his counsel be the first to act in the context of what can be subtle, delicate bargaining is a mistake. A defense attorney retained to take cases to trial could reasonably decide that the only hope for a client to secure a 30-year-sentence is to allow the State to make the first offer. Those are the sort of tactical judgments properly vested to the wisdom of counsel.

¹⁰ He also claims that he is entitled to relief under *Strickland* in any event. To the extent these arguments are preserved, they should be rejected.

¹¹ This argument is vaguely presented in Syed's supplement to his application for leave to appeal. Syed's motion for leave to file that supplement remains pending in this Court, but, regardless of how this Court rules on his motion, the argument is unpreserved. Although this Court may conclude that a lower court is right for a reason not argued below, it generally may not conclude that the lower court is wrong for a reason not argued below.

In fact, as discussed, *supra*, the Supreme Court held in *Lafler*, 132 S. Ct. 1376, and *Frye*, 132 S. Ct. 1399, that the *Strickland* standard applies to claims of ineffective assistance of counsel with respect to plea negotiations. Furthermore, Syed's claim is dependent on there being credible evidence that he asked Gutierrez to seek a plea offer from the State, that she failed to do so, and that she lied to him when she stated she did. The post-conviction court, however, did not credit even the first of these assumptions. (App. 16) ("In fact, Petitioner's own statements at sentencing indicate the contrary; that Petitioner intended to maintain his innocence throughout."). Not only was there no credible evidence before the post-conviction court that Syed asked Gutierrez to seek a plea offer, there was no credible evidence that Gutierrez lied to Syed in the manner he alleges. Thus, even if preserved, Syed's presumptive prejudice argument should be rejected.¹²

Ultimately, there is no proof that Syed and the State could have reached a tenable plea agreement. The understanding of all parties to the case — the prosecution, the defense, Syed and the family of Hae Min Lee — make clear that this was a case to be tried, not pled. Proceeding to trial was the choice Syed wanted. For these reasons, Syed failed to establish *Strickland* prejudice.

Enshrined in the Constitution is a guarantee that every criminal defendant will have effective representation. The importance of this bedrock commitment to the fairness of the criminal justice system cannot be overstated. But that safeguard is not an invitation to second guess tactical decisions and trial strategy, nor does it give license to smear the reputation of defense attorneys from the comfortable perch of history and hindsight. The promise of the

¹² Syed alludes to a polygraph examination that he sought to introduce into evidence to support his assertion that he asked Gutierrez to seek a plea offer. (Appellant's Brief at 27). The post-conviction court denied admission of the polygraph examination, and Syed did not challenge this ruling in his application for leave to appeal. The results of the inadmissible polygraph examination were not part of the proceedings below and do not have any bearing on the current appeal.

Sixth Amendment is sacrosanct, and there are no doubt defendants who are deprived of it. Adnan Syed, however, is not among them.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the State respectfully requests that the judgment of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland

THIRUVENDRAN VIGNARAJAH
Deputy Attorney General

EDWARD J. KELLEY
Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for Appellee

KELLEYE\Syed.Adnan.appeal.2319.2013.FINAL.MAY5.POSTREVIEW.wpd
Garamond13 point

PERTINENT PROVISIONS

United States Constitution, Amendment VI - Right to speedy trial, witnesses, etc.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Rule 3.3. Candor Toward the Tribunal.

- (a) A lawyer shall not knowingly:
 - (1) make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer;
 - (2) fail to disclose a material fact to a tribunal when disclosure is necessary to avoid assisting a criminal or fraudulent act by the client;
 - (3) fail to disclose to the tribunal legal authority in the controlling jurisdiction known to the lawyer to be directly adverse to the position of the client and not disclosed by opposing counsel; or
 - (4) offer evidence that the lawyer knows to be false. If a lawyer has offered material evidence and comes to know of its falsity, the lawyer shall take reasonable remedial measures.
- (b) The duties stated in paragraph (a) continue to the conclusion of the proceeding, and apply even if compliance requires disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6.
- (c) A lawyer may refuse to offer evidence that the lawyer reasonably believes is false.
- (d) In an ex parte proceeding, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer which will enable the tribunal to make an informed decision, whether or not the facts are adverse.
- (e) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a) through (d), a lawyer for an accused in a criminal case need not disclose that the accused intends to testify falsely or has testified falsely if the lawyer reasonably believes that the disclosure would jeopardize any constitutional right of the accused.

(2011)

Rule 8-131. Scope of review.

- (a) *Generally.* The issues of jurisdiction of the trial court over the subject matter and, unless waived under Rule 2-322, over a person may be raised in and decided by the appellate court whether or not raised in and decided by the trial court. Ordinarily, the appellate court will

not decide any other issue unless it plainly appears by the record to have been raised in or decided by the trial court, but the Court may decide such an issue if necessary or desirable to guide the trial court or to avoid the expense and delay of another appeal.

(b) *In Court of Appeals — Additional limitations.* (1) *Prior appellate decision.* Unless otherwise provided by the order granting the writ of certiorari, in reviewing a decision rendered by the Court of Special Appeals or by a circuit court acting in an appellate capacity, the Court of Appeals ordinarily will consider only an issue that has been raised in the petition for certiorari or any cross-petition and that has been preserved for review by the Court of Appeals. Whenever an issue raised in a petition for certiorari or a cross-petition involves, either expressly or implicitly, the assertion that the trial court committed error, the Court of Appeals may consider whether the error was harmless or non-prejudicial even though the matter of harm or prejudice was not raised in the petition or in a cross-petition.

(2) *No prior appellate decision.* Except as otherwise provided in Rule 8-304 (c), when the Court of Appeals issues a writ of certiorari to review a case pending in the Court of Special Appeals before a decision has been rendered by that Court, the Court of Appeals will consider those issues that would have been cognizable by the Court of Special Appeals.

(c) *Action tried without a jury.* When an action has been tried without a jury, the appellate court will review the case on both the law and the evidence. It will not set aside the judgment of the trial court on the evidence unless clearly erroneous, and will give due regard to the opportunity of the trial court to judge the credibility of the witnesses.

(d) *Interlocutory order.* On an appeal from a final judgment, an interlocutory order previously entered in the action is open to review by the Court unless an appeal has previously been taken from that order and decided on the merits by the Court.

(e) *Order denying motion to dismiss.* An order denying a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted is reviewable only on appeal from the judgment.

(2012)