April 21, 2003

Dear Representative .... :

When this letter of my urgent plea reaches you, I hope and pray that it will find you well and in the very best spirits as well.

I am writing to you seeking your help with a situation that I'm in. I believe that I have suffered a great injustice.

My name is Farley C. Matchett #999060, and I am on Texas' Death Row. As a minority, certain opportunities within the Texas Judicial System weren't afforded to me and others under the new Texas Habeas Art 11:071 Statute. This Statute guaranteed every death row inmate in Texas quality and competent State Habeas counsel.

I am asking that you review the attached information regarding the handling of death penalty cases by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals (CCA). I believe that "interpretation" of the new State Habeas Laws by the CCA has been to deny access to free and adequate counsel for death row inmates, rather than the opposite purpose for which it was intended. As a result, inmates are unable to obtain final appeals which could save their lives, and are being executed at an alarming rate in Texas.

In addition, I am asking that you review my personal situation as outlined below and in the enclosed affidavit; and that you contact lawmakers in Texas on my behalf; and in support of a moratorium on the death penalty in Texas. A summary of my arguments follows. Significant supporting details and references are provided on the following pages. I ask that you please carefully consider the following summary, as well as the detailed information and references.

Summary of Arguments

A. My Personal Situation:

As a direct result of the acts of incompetent counsel, I have not had the opportunity to present the crucial issues of my case to the court. The only way to reinstate the issues left out of my state habeas is for the 5th Circuit to return my case to the State level for another Habeas proceeding. I am asking for you to help me help by contacting the 5th Circuit court in Texas on my behalf. This is the only hope that I have to avoid execution. I will pay for a new habeas proceeding myself. I believe that I am entitled to a new trial for the following reasons:

1. My original court appointed lawyer was incompetent. His errors in the handling of my case included the following:

- Misadvising me on my plea, as a result barring me from a legitimate claim of self-defense.
- Advising me to plead guilty in order to avoid the death penalty, with the knowledge that the state intended to pursue the death penalty regardless of plea.
- Refusing to enter my "special issue" of self defense at trial, even after being asked three times by the Trial Judge if he wanted to do so, because there was "key evidence" indicating self-defense.

- His having me plea to a judge, not a jury, which was grounds for a new trial on direct appeal, is further evidence of the incompetence of my representation.
- Suffering from severe bouts of depression, my first court-appointed lawyer ultimately committed suicide.

2. I was cited for Abuse of Writ as the result of actions by a second incompetent court appointed lawyer:

- He (Tom Moran) was quoted in the *New York Times* as saying that he did not want to take any cases for the $7500 fee provided by the State, and was being forced to take mine.
- Five minutes into our initial meeting he stated that I had "no case" and "would be dead in a year"; but that he could file some "frivolous" writs to stretch it out…
- Subsequent to this conversation I hired my own lawyer who began researching my case and filed a 256-page writ. This writ is equivalent to "Exparte Kerr – 64 S.W. 3 d. 414" and under the laws of Art. 11:071, I should be entitled to a new Habeas process.
- Before my own lawyer was able to file his thorough writ, the court-appointed lawyer filed a 5 page writ by e-mail from the Netherlands, without researching my case. Three of the five issues that he presented in his writ were not cognizable under state habeas laws and therefore his work does not even constitute a writ.
- After an in-chambers hearing during which the Judge agreed that Tom Moran had left all of my crucial issues out of his writ, the Federal Judge to said that he'd like to send my case back to the State Court for only the issues left out of Mr. Moran's writ to be put in. A new State Habeas was prepared. It was denied by the CCA and I was cited for Abuse of Writ.

The sum result of the incompetence of my two court-appointed lawyers is that all roads to actual review of the real legal issues in my case were cut off to me.

B. **The need for a moratorium on the death penalty:** A moratorium on executions must be declared by ⅔ of the Texas Legislation, and two laws which hinder the due process intended by lawmakers for death row inmates must be repealed. Overwhelming evidence that the system is not working includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Misuse of funds which have been set-aside by law-makers for inmates' defense, for expert witnesses, psychologists, investigators and mitigation experts. Funds have been denied to inmates and returned to the state, constituting a hindrance of justice.
- Denial of the opportunity for DNA testing which could prove inmates' innocence, even when the inmate planned to pay for the testing himself.
- The DNA lab in Houston was found to be so negligent that it was closed due to gross errors.
- Three of the Justices on the CCA recently spoke out publicly and stated that the Court has been "knowingly" appointing incompetent counsel to death row inmates and that the December 4, 2002 execution of Leanord Rojas should have been stopped on these growds.
- The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that prosecutors in Texas have intentionally excluded blacks, Mexicans, Jews and Dagos from serving on jury panels.
- There is evidence that evidence has been falsified, including planting of stored blood samples on defendants' clothing, and "expert" testimony by psychologists who have not interviewed defendants, leading to conviction and execution.

Supporting Details and References

The reconstruction of the Texas State Habeas process came about through the 1995 Texas Legislative session, in which Texas Representative Pete Gallego ® authored a bill intended to provide inmates with a one-time avenue at the State Habeas procedure, with quality, competent and experienced lawyers in capital litigation, at the expense of the State of Texas. The bill was approved mainly because of an inmate who was strapped to the gurney in November 1994, who had had no lawyer after his first (direct) appeal. The Supreme Court intervened 20 minutes before he would have been executed. (See McFarland vs. Collins, 1994).

Lawmakers in Texas set aside some $7 million for the sole purpose of providing adequate defense to indigent death row inmates, including funding for investigators, expert witnesses and DNA testing. The lawmakers then turned the responsibility for administering the process of assigning competent counsel to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals (CCA). They were to appoint lawyers from a "competent" list and approve vouchers for investigators and expert witnesses, including psychologists, ballistics experts, etc. Controversy began immediately as the CCA set a cap of $7,500.00 per case for all appointed Habeas lawyers and $1000.000 for investigators and expert witnesses. Lawyers who were appointed balked and refused to take the cases. Those who were forced to take cases such as mine merely went through the motions and did little or nothing at all in the way of actual defense work. Many forgot deadlines for filing briefs, while most left out crucial legal issues from their defense documentation. In both instances the appeal processes became procedurally barred by default.

The CCA has been challenged on the issue of the competence of appointed lawyers numerous times, but the Presiding Judge, Sharon Keller, has stated that *"a lawyer need only a law license to be competent, and that satisfies this court."* This philosophy directly contradicts what Texas State Representative Pete Gallego authorized in his bill. This "misinterpretation" of the bill has cost individuals their lives without affording them due process.

When many appointed death row lawyers stood to accept Contempt of Court charges for such behavior as missing filing deadlines, publicity arose and the CCA backed off and gave thirty (30) cases each to three (3) of their law clerks. These three men promptly quit their jobs to accept these cases, and in a year's time, they would be given a total of 110 capital cases. This represents a serious and blatant conflict of interest. There is evidence that these three men did absolutely nothing to defend their clients The Court covered up their mistakes, and called their legal blunders "sound appellate strategy." The CCA created the problem of ineffective counsel for death row inmates, and rather than accept fault they are merely killing us and sweeping it under the rug!!! In a society as great as ours, how can we allow such Judicial atrocities to occur???

My direct appeal was denied on November 6, 1996 after being held up for 3 years while prosecutors lobbied legislators to change the law under which my appeal was granted. I had been guaranteed an automatic new trial under the law that existed at the time of my conviction, because my case was pled to a trial Judge rather than a jury. The very fact that my (first) court-appointed lawyer insisted that I plead to a Judge is evidence of his incompetence. I was then appointed a second State Habeas lawyer to handle my appeal, without my having asked for one.

The second appointed, State Habeas lawyer, Tom Moran (Houston, TX) met me at the Ellis One Unit in Huntsville, Texas. Five (5) minutes into our conversation he told me that there

was nothing in my case and that I'd be dead within a year, but that he could stretch it to a year and a half by filing "frivolous" appeals. I looked the man in the eye and let him know that I had studied every Capital case in Texas from 1924 (Pre-Furman) up to 1995 (Post-Furman), and that I knew every legal aspect of my case...and that I would be writing to the Judge to let him know of our conversation. Mr. Moran immediately changed his demeanor and apologized, but I knew I couldn't trust him, so when I went back to my cell, I wrote my supporters and told them that I wanted to hire David L. Botsford of Austin, TX. While I was awaiting a response, the Trial Judge, William T. Harmon (178 Judicial District) wrote to me and sent me a copy of a letter that he wrote to Tom Moran. The Judge told Mr. Moran, in his letter, that because of his January 1997 appointment to the War Crimes Tribunal in the Netherlands, he would not be subjected to the filing deadline for my writ (under the new State Habeas law Art. 11:071), until 90 days after he returned from the "conclusion of the tribunal". The conclusion was March 1999.

When I met David Botsford at Ellis One Unit in April 1997, we agreed upon a price for his services and I signed a contract. Two weeks later he was paid in full. He began to communicate with Tom Moran, who was in the Netherlands. In August 1997, Mr. Moran underhandedly e-mailed a writ to the Court, even though he knew that I had hired an attorney to represent me. This is the same man who was quoted in the *New York Times* (November 1996) as saying that he "didn't want to take my case or any other case for $7500.000" and he was "being forced" to take mine, but it would be "the only one." It is strange and unfortunate that he found interest in my case when another lawyer had been hired...and all for $7500.00.

Mr. Moran did no investigation into my case, as he wasn't even in the country for two years. He left out all of my most important and crucial legal issues, which are, as a result, procedurally barred from further consideration by the Court. My most significant claim is because my trial attorney advised me to plead guilty – He told me that the State would not seek the death penalty if I did, when in fact he knew that they were intending to do so. He refused to allow the Trial Judge to put in the special issue of self-defense, even after the Judge asked him three (3) times, because "key evidence" pointed to self defense. The issue of "ineffective assistance of counsel" was raised on my direct appeal, which had 39 good issues, and the issue of the guilty plea, which was not good because the Trial Court accepted it before my jury panel was sworn in, was also raised. That's when the prosecutors of Harris County held up my appeal while the lobbied to change the law which had guaranteed me a new trial.

Mr. Botsford turned in my 256 page writ in December 1998, and a conflict began in March 1999 when Tom Moran returned from the Netherlands and sought his payment of $7500.00 from the Court. The Court coordinator had set his payment aside as she was aware of the Trial Judge's letter granting him extra time to submit his writ. She then informed Mr. Moran that Mr. Botsford had a writ ready and on file.

A hearing was set up and Mr. Botsford produced a contract with my signature dated April 19, 1997, which the prosecutors denounced on the grounds that the State had appointed a lawyer to me before that date, and it was my duty to file a motion to dismiss. Mr. Botsford countered on the grounds of ethics – that Mr. Moran knew that I had hired Mr. Botsford, and Mr. Moran should have filed a motion to withdraw. The Court sided with the prosecutor and kept Mr. Moran's five (5) page, five (5) issue writ on file. Three (3) of the issues filed in Mr. Moran's writ are "not cognizable" under the State Habeas law, so, in essence, there are only two (2) issues presented in that document.

Mr. Botsford referred me to a legal specialist, Mr. Charlton, who he said could, more than likely, get me back to a new State Habeas proceeding where I could reinstitute my legal issues.

When the CCA denied me in a vote of 6-3, Mr. Charlton filed a motion into the Federal Court for a hearing. A Chamber Hearing was granted, whereupon he presented to the Federal Judge, in the presence of the Assistant Attorney General, the prosecutor and my other Attorney, Mr. Greenwood, solid evidence that Tom Moran did absolutely nothing on my behalf and that he left out all of my crucial legal issues from his writ. The Federal Judge agreed and said that he'd like to send my case back to the State Court for only the issues left out of his writ to be put in. No new issues could be added. Everyone in the room agreed.

A new State Habeas was prepared with only the left out issues. The CCA held the writ for exactly 89 days and then promptly denied it on the 90th day. Then, to make matters worse, they hit me with an Abuse of Writ citation, thus barring my Federal review. These events legally tied the Judge's hands. He therefore wrote a blistering opinion that said that I "did not receive the bare minimum requirements under the Habeas reform law Art. 11:071 because of incompetent counsel, who couldn't distinguish priorities of a client on a war crime tribunal facing only 'life' and a client on death row facing lethal injection."

So, now, my appeal heads to the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, Louisiana, which is notoriously pro-death penalty. As a result of the "work" of my incompetent court-appointed lawyer, I head into these proceedings with a good opinion on only one issue (as the others have been barred)...and a strong prayer. What has been done to me isn't right, but there's no point in my crying about the past. Time is crucial and my life is on the line. I am asking you personally to look into the injustices bestowed upon me and to please help me by demanding that I receive a new Habeas review.

There are countless minorities, being executed by the State of Texas, all because the CCA has misinterpreted the law. Their interpretation versus what is written seems to be from a pro-prosecutorial standpoint. There is no win when the denial rate of said Court is 98.5%!! This Court is totally out of control and they have in fact killed innocent people including minorities.

If we examine the case of Gary "Shake Sankofa" Graham for example: Crucial doubt existed, but the State killed him anyway, even against the wishes of the victim's wife.

Charles Boyd, another black man, passed a DNA test to prove that he did not rape the victim. Barry Sheck's office supervised the testing. The State turned to its own DPS lab and said that the test was inconclusive, but that the defendant could not be excluded. It was not surprising that Mr. Boyd could not be excluded, as the alleged killer was black, which was known because there was black skin found under the victim's fingernails. But upon Mr. Boyd's arrest, there was not one scratch on his body. Detectives testified that they stripped him naked and he did not have a scratch anywhere. Nevertheless, he was executed, crying for justice.

Odell Barness, another brother, proved that the State put the victim's blood on his clothing. Lab tests found high levels of citrus preservatives in the blood, the type of preservative is found in test tubes used to store blood samples. Nevertheless, this man was also executed.

David Wayne Spence, a white man, proved his innocence through TV Producer Brian Pardo. Even his former prosecutor said he had doubts…especially after Mr. Spence's fall partner Mundeer Deeb was exonerated. Nevertheless, he too was killed crying for justice.

Mexican Nationals are violated of their consulate rights and quickly executed, but we want other countries to honor the International Treaties when Americans are arrested. This situation in Texas is out of control and there has to be something that you, as a member of Congress, can do to help me and others like me.

What this state really needs is a **moratorium on executions** because it is clear that this system is broken. How many more lives will have to be lost because people were denied their Constitutional rights to effective assistance of counsel and due process of the law?

The Houston Police Department crime lab has recently been exposed for producing contaminated evidence and providing false testimony. For example, in Josiah Sutton's case, the HPD lab "expert" swore that she was 99% sure, from her testing, that Mr. Sutton was guilty. Four and a half years later, three other labs said that there was no laboratory evidence confirming his guilt. False, or perhaps "bought and paid for", testimony has always been able to produce the results that prosecutors seek. For a price, psychologists will stand and swear that the defendant will be a "continuing threat to society".

My psychologist proved that I was non-violent and suffered from an episode of brief psychosis from drug addiction, over 72 hours. The state had no ready testimony, so they called a 30 minute recess, after which they produced a Dr. Walter Quijano, who looked at my psychologist's notes and determined that I was a threat to society. Bought and paid for testimony!! This man also said Blacks and Mexicans are over-represented in Texas prisons so they will continue to be a threat to society. The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Saladeno vs. Scott said race can not be a determining factor in deciding whether a defendant will be a threat to society. The lower courts are still looking at the color of the defendant's skin as a factor in court cases, no mater how articulate or educated a defendant may be…to this day.

One of the most notorious psychologists was "Dr. Death", James P. Grigson, who traveled all over Texas giving false testimony on "threat to society" issues. Most noted defendants were Randal Dale Adams, Clarence Bradley, Andrew Mitchell, Mundeer Deeb and Fred Marcias. Dr. Grigson swore on a stack of Bibles that these men would be a continuing threat to society, and like the State psychologist who testified against me, he had never interviewed the defendants. I am glad to say that as you read this, all of the aforementioned men are free and living crime-free, productive lives. The American Psychiatric Association has stated that no one can predict a person's future behavior and denounces this practice, but it still continues in Texas to this day. If the State psychologist in my case was correct, I would have all sorts of violent disciplinary infractions on my record, but in 10 years on death row, I have never had a violent disciplinary infraction. In fact, I have had only 2 minor infractions…for contraband cigarettes.

Justice Sharon Keller is the most controversial Justice on the Court of Criminal Appeals bench. It was she who repeatedly denied relief to Roy Criner, despite the fact that DNA tests showed that he was not the rapist. Her theory…"he could have been wearing a condom." There was semen in the decedent's vaginal cavity, so it is safe to say that "someone" wasn't wearing a condom. It is amazing that this argument stood up to the criteria of "reasonable doubt." In the case of Anthony Graves, she says…"death row inmates are not entitled to the right to contest whether an appointed lawyer deemed competent actually does a competent job. It satisfies the Court that he's competent at the time of appointment." So in essence she is saying that if 6 months into a case a lawyer has a mental breakdown…his competency cannot be contested. To strongly contradict her on this issue, most recently three of the Justices on the CCA spoke out publicly and stated that the Court has been "knowingly" appointing incompetent counsel to death row inmates and that the December 4, 2002 execution of Leanord Rojas should have been stopped because his appointed attorney missed filing deadlines through gross incompetence, resulting in Mr. Rojas' appeal being procedurally barred on the Federal level. This is exactly what has happened to me!! The Justices who spoke out, Tom Price, Cheryl Johnson and Charles Holcomb were chastised by Sharon Keller who said…"even if an applicant is entitled to any relief, any jurisdiction this Court might arguably have had over applicants claims…<u>expired upon his execution</u>." That

contradicts what she herself said in the Anthony Graves case. It is frightening that this woman is the Chief Justice of the Court that determines life or death in Texas.

Court appointed lawyers have brought cases before Judge Keller wherein they had copied other cases verbatim, and had done no investigative work. Some never visited with their clients. Two inmates had been appointed lawyers who hadn't visited them in over a year – The state had moved to deny the default appeals of these defendants for missing filing deadlines when they learned that their lawyer had been dead for 14 months, concrete evidence that the CCA does not police their "competent attorneys" list. Still, Justice Keller went on to deny the two inmates the right to new Habeas proceedings… saying that it was their responsibilities to contact their attorneys! The law says that the lawyer is to contact the inmate within 30 days of appointment by phone, in person or by letter. Once again, the Presiding Judge has shown less competence than the incompetent lawyers that she appoints.

Justice Keller has refused to give indigent death row inmates the allotted funds set aside by lawmakers for their defense, and has returned $886,000 to the State Treasury. For those without outside financial support, it is difficult to prove one's innocence, when the allotted resources are denied. She will not grant DNA tests, even when a defendant tries to pay for his own...She fought Jessie Patrick, who requested a (self-paid) DNA test three months prior to his execution. Her argument was that he was trying to delay his execution, but it would have taken only 2-3 weeks for this test. He was executed on September 17, 2002. The law says that if a DNA test will prove a different outcome (i.e. innocence vs. guilt), you are entitled to receive one.

Any and all forms of due process have been eliminated in Texas, and that was not the vision upon which our Court of Criminal Appeals was founded. The CCA has been given the responsibility to be "Interpreters of the Law" by the Texas Constitution, in all criminal appellate cases on the State level. Unfortunately, somewhere in the mid-1990's, when George W. Bush became Governor, the Court stepped far of the path of justice upon which it was founded. And death came swiftly without adequate forms of legal representation for the accused.

CCA records reflect a 98.5% denial rate on State Habeas review, even though over 90% of the applicants have legitimate claims of ineffective counsel, due in whole to the Court's reluctance to appoint competent and quality counsel as dictated by the law. Cases have been merely rubber-stamped by clerks and never reviewed by the actual Justices.

Members of the CCA itself have publicly acknowledged the Court's misdeeds in appointing incompetent counsel as ascribed under the new Habeas laws. What I and many others have received was judicial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct, incompetent counsel and ineffective assistance of counsel. The CCA has turned this appellate process into a mockery of justice. Because a real examination of the situation would require the CCA to review its own faults, rather than do so, they have covered up their mistakes and inadequacies and turned a blind eye to justice.

This blatant failure to give equal and exact justice under the law to each and every appellant will one day come back to haunt Texas in a bad way. Already, atrocities are coming to light. There is no justice in this very broken-down system, despite what our Governor Perry says. With a majority Court, the pro-prosecutorial allegiance is not in the interest of justice. Human lives are at stake, and the current environment is tilted toward prosecution at all cost, resulting in the destruction of human lives at an alarming rate. Three hundred (300) people have been executed in Texas since 1982!!! There is something drastically wrong with this picture.

The current environment in Texas, in which inmates are freely executed without due process, would diminish if two Texas laws could be repealed. First, the "Immunity Laws" must be

repealed by Texas legislators, so that prosecutors and Judges can be held accountable for malicious, unwarranted prosecution of defendants whose crimes aren't legitimate capital murder cases under the capital litigation statues. Those litigators who violate these laws would lose their license to practice for one year or more. The prosecution rate would sharply decline, as evidenced in Illinois. Secondly, the repeal of the "Texas Inquest Laws" would bring to the public view cases in which innocent people may have been executed. As it stands now, the laws prevent anyone, including the executed person's family, from proving the executed person's innocence. That is how former Governor Bush and present Governor Perry can declare that no innocent person has been executed in Texas under their watches. We all know that that is not true, but how can it be proven, when laws prevent the gathering of evidence? Until this law is repealed, we'll never be able to demonstrate to the public that innocent people have been executed. With a repealed "Texas Inquest Law", I am certain that Texas will be shown to be the true killer. Until this law and the Immunity Law are repealed, Texas will continue to wreak havoc on the poor, the minorities, the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. James Colburn, a severe paranoid schizophrenic, for example, was killed on March 26, 2003.

There is too much wrong with the current system in Texas for there to be no moratorium on executions. The US Supreme Court has said that blacks, Mexicans, Jews, Dagos and Catholics are purposefully struck from serving on capital juries on Texas. This is 2003. This needs to stop. Our system is racist and corrupt, and minorities will continue to fall between its cracks until something is done to change it. Blacks are 9 times more likely to be sent to death row in Texas than whites, and if that isn't racism, I don't know what is.

We have a corrupt DNA lab which has lost its FBF accreditation due to corrupt and contaminated DNA evidence. We have three CCA Justices brave enough to admit to the Court's knowledge of appointing incompetent counsel and, finally, we have a Board of Pardons and Parole with salaries of $80K per year, who meet by phone or fax in "closed sessions". They should hold open meetings in the presence of the defendants because over time, people do change, and the public should be able to witness this.

I think all of this evidence strongly supports the fact that we do need a moratorium in Texas, despite arguments from our Governor to the contrary. I understand that you do not have direct influence in this matter, but if you can telephone the Legislators and State Senators in Texas, I believe that you can help. The system in Texas is clearly not working as it was meant to – to provide fair and equal representation to all. As a United States Congressperson, this must be a concern to you. I have personally not received fair and adequate representation and I am begging for your help, as my back is against the wall.

Please review the enclosed affidavit prepared by my lawyer, and you will see the many systematic failures that have occurred in the representation of my case. I am asking for a new State Habeas proceeding at my own expense, and nothing else. I believe that I am entitled to a new proceeding due in part to the incompetent "work" of Mr. Tom Moran, whose writ was an insult to the authors of "The Great and True Writ". It was clearly prepared without any investigation into my case whatsover. Justice has been denied to me and I'm only asking for fairness. My legal issues which were left out will prove my self defense claim and take me off of death row, but for this to happen I need for you to stand up for justice and what is right.

Due to Tom Moran's incompetence, I have just one legal issue going into the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, Louisiana, but in my heart I have an abundance of hope because three Justices spoke out about the lawyers of the 1995 Habeas reform, the law under which Tom Moran was appointed to my case in 1996.

I am begging you to please step in and make some calls to Texas and to use your influence as a member of Congress to demand that I be given a new State Habeas proceeding under the guidelines of Art. 11:071, and that they support a moratorium on executions in Texas. I was clearly appointed incompetents counsel. As a result, all avenues of legal appeal were closed off to me. It is clear that in my case and others, counsels' work has been nowhere near the minimum prescribed in the Art. 11:071 Habeas laws. I have, to this point, been denied due process. All I'm asking for is systematic fairness under the law, which should be afforded to every man and woman in this country, regardless race, creed or ethnic background. There is no way to correct errors once a person has been wrongly executed.

My life hangs by a thread when it should sit in the balanced scales of justice. I sit close to a death bordering on barbarism. Execution is wrong, but if we must have a death penalty, let there be one that is correct, color-blind and affords every defendant equal and exact justice under the law. That way, there will be no mistakes and unbalanced scales of justice… and no innocent person will fall through the large cracks in the judicial system of today.

Thank you for your time in this matter and I truly hope and pray that you'll help me obtain the justice that I seek, as ascribed under the provisions of Art. 11:071. God Bless You.

Sincerely,

Farley C. Matchett, 999060
Polunsky Unit
3872 FM 350 South
Livingston, TX 77351

dnr

FCM/log

Enclosures

REFERENCES

1. Roy E. Greenwood, Attorney at Law
   512-329-5858 (office)
   12-329-9199 (fax)
   reglaw@austin.rr.com

2. Michael B. Charlton, Attorney at Law
   1744 Norfolk
   Houston, TX 77098
713-572-2333

Charlton@orbitworld.net

3. No:71,664-A; In the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas, Austin, Texas
4. No: 653985-A; In the 178th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas; ExParte: Farley Matchett
5. No: H-02-1844-Civin Action; In the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas; Houston Division
6. Case Currently Pending before the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals; New Orleans, Louisiana; Justice Carolyn D. King – Presiding Judge.
7. Farley C. Matchett -- #999060
   Allan B. Polunsky Unit
   3872 FM, 350 South
   Livingston, TX, 77351

Online: www.DeathRow-Texas.com