THE SECRETARY: The Honorable Members of the Pennsylvania Board of Fardons are now in session. Lieutenant Governor, Mark Ashwhiten preciding.

You may be seated.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I'll call the May 6,
1999 Public Session of the Pennsylvania Board of
Pardons to order.

On behalf of the board, allow me to welcome everyone. Many have travelled great distance to be with us today. Let me mention, as well as provide some comments at the opening here, mention that this is something on behalf of the board that I try to regularly do to help those who are visiting a part of the support of pardons session for the first time. Whether you are applicant, supporter, proponent, opponent, victim or survivor, to come to know what it is, what we will provide today in terms of process and flow.

First, I think it makes sense to introduce the members of the board. On my immediate right is the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, Mike Fisher. On my immediate left is the Warden of Butler County Prison from Western Pennsylvania,

Rich Gilotti, and on my far right is the Victim Representative from Lancaster County, Louise Williams.

I should point out that the position on the board that is occupied by a psychologist or psychiatrist at the moment is vacant due to the retirement of a long serving, Dan Minitti.

Let me also emphasize, folks, as you, if you are to come to the floor here and comment, I ask on behalf of the board that all participants speak clearly and loud enough to be heard and right to the mike.

In a moment, we will take up, before we turn to the Goldblum request, the Goldblum matter, well, we'll deal with the review cases under item 2. We'll take a public vote on those. We've got 13 of them, one was continued. We'll move through that quickly. That will take us about five minutes. It will appear at times that we handle it quickly, but I do wish to confirm for you that extensive preparation by each board member has occurred prior to taking our seat today.

I am going to guess that today's session will go until like 1 p.m. today, including both

the Goldblum case, which we'll kick off in a moment, and deal with the first thing this morning, as well as making a decision only on the Goldblum matter, and that is after the review cases are dealt with.

If you need an agenda, they can be acquired at the door. Let me clear the agenda for you. First, we'll take up the review cases public vote in item 2. I should mention for review cases, and the chair will correct itself, we have 25 review cases. There is no public discussion of the review cases. It is a matter of each board member through a yes or no vote, and only that, deciding whether or not they wish a case to be scheduled on the calendar and to be heard in its entirety.

Again, it's going to move along quickly. It will take us about 5 or 10 minutes. We should be done by 10 after, 9:15, perhaps.

In most cases, two affirmative votes are required for an application to receive a full public hearing. However, if the applicant is serving a sentence of life imprisonment or a sentence for a crime of violence such as the Goldblum case, three affirmative votes are

required for the application to be granted for public hearing, and you'll know if the case has received enough votes to have a full public hearing at a future board of pardons session when the secretary announces, hearing granted, or hearing denied after the vote has been called in each case. So, you'll hear that 25 times, that outcome.

In any of the cases that I mentioned earlier, those in which the applicant is serving life imprison or a sentence for a crime of violence is granted a public hearing, the applicant will be interviewed by the members at the convenience of the board prior to hearing the case in public session at an undisclosed location, at a secured location. Again, we should take care of that rather quickly.

That brings us to item three on the calendar, cases to be heard by the board.

First we'll take up the Goldblum case. We will hear both from the proponents and the opponents, we will then retire to an executive session just moments after we complete the section where we hear from the opponents of the commutation. We will caucus and return and make the decision.

I would project that it is probably somewhere between 11 a.m. and 12 p.m. then we will return. We'll go back to executive session, regroup and then come back and hear the balance of the docket and that is the 13 cases that you see under cases to be heard by the board, actually, 12, because one was continued.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

1 Û

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

After hearing in entirety the calendar cases, we will then recess to the executive session the second time. I'll not the time that we begin and the time that we return. We'll then reconveen and take the public vote on the balance of those 12 cases that are part of the docket. The outcome of the calendar cases and this is relevant to the Goldblum decision, will be announced by the secretary after the vote in each case, and there are three possible outcomes. One, application recommended, which means that we are recommending to Governor Ridge that clemency be granted to an applicant. The second is application denied, which means that a recommendation for clemency will not be made and, therefore, clemency will not be granted at this time. And the third, and it

is similar to a continuance, we could hold an application under advisement. I want to emphasize that the ultimate decision to accept or reject the recommendation of this court is solely at the disgression of the governor.

And, under old business, I think that you'll see that we have three requests for reconsideration. This doesn't happen too often. We'll take those up under item 6, and if there is a need for comments by board members, they can do that under item 7. And, obviously, under 8 we can finish up through an adjournment motion.

Just two final thoughts. We are guests of the supreme court while in this chamber.

Unnecessary talking and disturbances of any kind are not tolerated. If that happens, you'll be asked to leave. So, with that, I'll ask the Secretary to begin the process of recording the public vote on the review cases and then we will go right to Goldblum.

Mr. Secretary.

(Whereupon, the review cases were voted on.)

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Again, I would point out that extensive preparation has occurred

1	prior to each board member taking their place
2	here this morning on each and every one of
3	those decisions and cases. With that we
4	complete the review section and we'll move to
5	section 3, the cases to be heard by the board.
6	The first calendar case this morning is
7	the matter of Charles Goldblum.
8	You are?
9	MR. GILMORE: My name is Jim Gilmore,
10	Assistant District Attorney from Allegheny County
11	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I'm assuming that
12	you're in opposition?
13	MR. GILMORE: To the applicant.
14	MR. MARKOVITZ: I'm here for the applicant.
15	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You are?
16	MR. MARKOVITZ: Lee Markovitz.
17	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You can take you
18	place at the mike.
19	You are?
20	MR. EYSTER: Chris Rand Eyster.
21	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: And your purpose?
22	MR. EYSTER: I'm one of Mr. Goldblum's
23	attorneys.
24	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Are you going to have
25	an active role here?

2

3

4

5

б

•

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EYSTER: Yes.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay. You can take your place.

Good morning, Mr. Markovitz. I know yourself have prepared for this moment. With that, let me explain, typically, and I think it is worth reiteration. Typically, in cases, even those where we're talking about murder one, the 15 minutes is provided by the board for those who support the idea of commutation and those who oppose it. Because of the nature of this case, and I think the impressive efforts of you and others and supporters, and the same could be said for those who oppose the commutation as far as effort, we'll not hold to that today, but at this point it is 9:15 and it is, and I believe that I speak for the board, our intention, our aspiration that we begin to finish up somewhere between 9:45 and no later than 10. Is that understood?

MR. MARKOVITZ: Yes, sir. I think that you'll be pleased by the brevity of my remarks, and then I'll entertain questions from the board.

First of all I would like to thank the

4 5

1.8

board for granting the public hearing in this matter. We very much appreciate that and consider it a sign of good faith, and I thank each and every one of you for holding this hearing today.

Many people have come here to show their support for this application, and I'm not going to introduce these people, but there is one particular person that I think that I would be remiss if I did not introduce to the board, who is here today, and that is United States Senator Rudy Boschwitz. Senator Boschwitz, would you stand?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Markovitz, direct your comments to the chair. I'll handle acknowledgements if they're appropriate. Go ahead.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Okay. Thank you.

me. I was looking through my file on this case and I came across an old photocopy of a photograph of George Wilhelm. It was one of his autopsy photographs. And I suppose that it is really impossible to stand in the shoes of the murder victim, but holding that photograph

А

Ь

Ĥ

in my hand I tried to stand in George Wilhelm's shoes. This man was cheated, betrayed and then murdered by his best friend, and some say, his lover, Clarence Miller.

As he lay in the cold February snow, cut up and bleeding, his nose virtually amputated from his face, he identified his murderer to the first person who arrived at the scene, a Pittsburgh police officer. Clarence. Clarence Miller did this to me. What perfect justice, if it is one's fate to be murdered, to live long enough to identify your murderer to the police.

But, what would George Wilhelm think today? He would know that in addition to convicting his murderer, the state also convicted a man who was innocent of his murder. A man he didn't even know. How would George Wilhelm feel about that?

George Wilhelm was an honest, law abiding man who was pursuing his dreams, but at the trials of his accused murderer, the state called him an arsonist and a felon, based only on the testimony of his best friend, Clarence Miller. And, of course, Mr. Wilhelm was deceased and could not answer that accusation. How would

2

3

4

J

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

George Wilhelm feel about that?

Here we have a case where the dying murder victim identified Clarence Miller as his murderer. He did not say, Clarence Miller and Charles goldblum. He did not say Clarence Miller and that lawyer. He did not say Clarence Miller and that other guy. George Wilhelm's dying declaration speaks to you, twenty-three years later, Clarence. Clarence Miller did this to me.

Is this not enough for the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons? This dying declaration, itself as reliable as any testimony that can ever be given was further supported by all of the forensic evidence gathered by the police. And, I'll tell you that I have been a criminal lawyer for 15 years, and I have never seen a more inept police investigation then what took place in this case. Scratches found on Clarence Miller the day after the murder were never photographed or analyzed. A blood splatter across the dashboard of the vehicle where the attack commenced, was never photographed or analyzed. Apparently content with their own level of expertise, the police never consulted

•

with any forensic experts. Unfortunately, neither did Mr. Goldblum's trial lawyer.

To make up for the lack of expertise from the police, three of the world's forensic experts were retained to analyze the crime scene evidence. All three have concluded that Goldblum was not the killer. Is this not enough for the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons?

Is there a more respected judge in this

Commonwealth than Donald Ziggler who presided

at Goldblum's trial and who now sits as the

Chief Federal Judge in Western Pennsylvania?

Judge Ziggler said that he found Clarence Miller

unworthy of belief as a witness. Judge Ziggler

says that after trying all of these criminal

cases for twenty some odd years, this case alone

bothers his conscious. Is that not enough for the

Pennsylvania Board of Pardons?

Then there is Peter Dixon. In an age when lawyers seem to be held in such low esteem, can there be a better answer than Peter Dixon? He prosecuted an average of two homicide cases each month for years in the Allegheny County District Attorney's Office, making him one of the most important members of our community.

2

З

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Each of us knows how difficult it is to admit, even to ourselves, I got this wrong, I didn't get this right. How about admitting it publically? How about coming to the state capital and proclaiming it? How about when you're a prosecutor and it's a homicide case and a life sentence? How about when it's the most important case of your long and distinguished career? Try to calculate the courage and integrity of Peter Dixon. Will you honor that courage and integrity? Peter Dixon prosecuted both Goldblum and Miller for the murder of George Wilhelm. He's here to tell you now that Goldblum is innocent of that murder. Is this not enough for the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons?

You have reviewed Mr. Goldblum's prison record. You know it is an excellent record. He has been as active and as productive as a prisoner can be. You also know that he has a wonderful family and many, many good friends who have stood by him all of these years and who stand by him now to help him adjust to life as a free man. Is this not enough for the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons?

Members of the Board, what will it be? 1 Will you have the personal integrity to do the 2. right thing? The courage to do the right thing? 3 Will you have the courage to do justice? Thousands of citizens of this Commonwealth are watching and waiting, and soon all of us will 6 know what the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons is 7 about. thank you. That will conclude my remarks, and if the board has any questions --9 10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Who is coming up here? 11 MR. MARKOVITZ: The next speaker would be 12 Mr. Dixon. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon. Can you 13 14 give us your full name for the record? 15 MR. DIXON: My name is F. Peter Dixon, 16 D-i-x-o-n. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Great. This is your 17 18 opportunity to comment. And before we launch 19 into this period, any questions for 20 Mr. Markovitz from board members? 21 Warden? 22 WARDEN GILOTTI: Yes. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon, could you 23 24take your place. Counsellor, come on up. We 25 need to clarify a few things here.

WARDEN GILOTTI: I can't let you get away with all of those comments without saying something back to you.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Go right ahead.

warden GILOTTI: I do appreciate your opening remarks. I know all of the board members, including myself, on the years that I've been on the board, this is the most amount of time that I've ever had on one case, obviously, volumes, which you've been very successful in getting to us along with the staff of the Board of Pardons. I do have a couple of questions for you.

You've laid out a plan of action indicating the type of facts or evidence that you would like to produce here, one of which, you mentioned about the dying declaration, and I also know the serious impact that has had and has. I am not a hundred percent convinced that the dying declaration was finished in its entirety. Here is a man, who no doubt said what he had said, but it also leaves open that door, it does not shut that door that more could be said if he was able to do it, particularly if there was that much time he could have certainly described

1.4

1.5

other people that were there, and he didn't.

So, yes, it is a very weighty statement, and it certainly gives strong indications against Clarence Miller, but it doesn't shut the door, in my opinion.

MR. MARKOVITZ: May I respond to that?
WARDEN GILOTTI: Sure.

MR. MARKOVITZ: The evidence was Mr.

Wilhelm died about two hours or so after this attack. He was aware and conscious at the scene. He complained to the police about his nose, about his face. They apparently could not get an ambulance. I guess the ambulances were too tall or something, and they had to get him down from the top of this parking garage on a station wagon. He was conscious and aware. He made statements such as, I'm going to die.

I'm going to die. He was conscious and aware and able to speak and had ample opportunity to identify another attacker in some form, whether it was by name --

WARDEN GILOTTI: I agree with that, but he also didn't say, ask Goldblum, he was there, he'll tell you. He never mentioned Goldblum's name.

25

MR. MARKOVITZ: Understood. But, you know, when you're --

WARDEN GILOTTI: That raises a question.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, you know,

Mr. Gilotti, we can never prove innocence a hundred percent certain. If that is the standard, then I'll concede defeat now. But, when you take a look at the dying declaration and the fact that it is supported by all of the forensic evidence gathered, and the lack of evidence as to Mr. Goldblum, and knowing how little time we have here, and how complicated the case is, I submitted all of these things to you, and the gloves that were found at the scene. The lack of blood on Mr. Goldblum's clothing, the lack of any connection between Mr. Goldblum and the murder weapon, and on and on, and I think the failure to present a motive that stands up under scrutiny. And I think that Mr. Dixon will address himself to that motive, which is the land fraud --

WARDEN GILOTTI: Opposite things that occurred in a full trial --

MR. MARKOVITZ: Yes.

WARDEN GILOTTI: Which was one of the

challenges that the Board of Pardons faces in 1 requests of this nature. We're not privy or able to take advantage of discovery in ample 3 amount kinds of things that are associated with 4 complete trials, and I think that is why you pursue the appeal. 6 MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, the board has the 7 benefit of --LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I think what Warden 9 Gilotti is getting at here is that I think 10 that you would admit that your strongest 11 emphases, so far, is this remark. What did 12 Wilhelm say? 13 MR. MARKOVITZ: Clarence. Clarence Miller 14 did this to me. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: How would this 16 disprove, or somehow confirm that Goldblum 17 wasn't a participant? 18 MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, you know, it was 19 20 the --LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: How does it advance 21 to that? 22 MR. MARKOVITZ: Because it was the Common-23 wealth's theory that Wilhelm and Goldblum knew 24 each other. If Goldblum was involved in this 25

1.5

murder, wouldn't Mr. Wilhelm have said so?

trying to understand, I think what the Warden is getting at, after being stabbed 26 times over probably a two minute period, and what is disputed is whether or not Goldblum physically had a role in any of that, even from the back seat. Isn't it plausable that the victim stabbed 26 times over a vicious two minute period, and then is thrown from height, and then hits the concrete, that perhaps he could be on the verge of incoherence and unable to complete the remark?

MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, he was able to continue communicating with the police --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I think that we're agreeing that you can't prove or disprove anything.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, I think it goes a long way toward disproving it. Let me ask, if I may inquire of you, let me ask this. A man is imprisoned for 23 years. Are you saying that you have to be one hundred percent convinced of his innocence before letting him out?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The board members

can answer that for themselves.

2

MR. MARKOVITZ: Because you see my --

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The challenge of this board, counsellor, is to respect the wishes of the original 12 person jury, and the law of this state be a matching, unanimous agreement by the Board of Pardons. So, yeah, that is a standard to reach and that is what we're going to, at this moment, intellectually, we're dabbling in

GENERAL FISHER: Let me add something else, Mr. Markovitz.

> MARKOVITZ: Yes, sir. MR.

that very consideration, so, yeah.

GENERAL FISHER: And I appreciate the passion in which you presented your opening argument, and I certainly, I appreciate the passion for which everyone who is here with you is here on this case as well as they've submitted a number of documents to us, but for those who are here and listening to this case, today is only a brief part of the review of the Board of Pardons into this matter.

At an earlier session, approximately a month ago, we, all four of us personally visited the State Correctional Institute over at Camp

Hill and gave Mr. Goldblum a full and ample opportunity to explain his position in this case.

I think what the question was you asked the Lieutenant Governor, about the standard is, is slightly different in this case for this reason. Your client is a convicted criminal.

And even under his own admission he was involved in some very serious cases. The record would indicate that he was involved in even more than he admitted to us, ie, the solicitation to murder two homicides detectives in Pittsburgh.

The issue, which he clearly put before this board, and the standard in which he asked us to review this case, was not whether or not 22 or 23 years is enough to serve in the case of the homicide, but here he clearly put before this board that he was innocent of the killing of George Wilhelm. That's the issue here.

We're not here to decide the length of sentence, in fact, the computation of time that Mr.

Goldblum needs to serve goes beyond this board's decision making power. But I just want to add that, that Mr. Goldblum has framed the issue. And the issue here for us, as I see it, as one member of the board, is whether or not,

1 based on our role, as members of the Pardon 2 Board, we believe that Mr. Goldblum is innocent of the killing of George Wilhelm. That is the 3 4 decision that we have to make. So I just wanted to frame that issue. 5 I'm not -- face that issue with you right 6 7 now, but I want to make sure that the people who are here listening understand that's what 8 the issue is. It's not the length of time. 9 10 MR. MARKOVITZ: I understand that. GENERAL FISHER: He didn't make that 11 12 argument. 13 MR. MARKOVITZ: That's actually one of the things that I wanted to mention when the 14 Lieutenant Governor says, why should we undo 1.5 16 the jury's verdict? Is that essentially --17 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That's one of many 18 questions. MR. MARKOVITZ: And I want to address 19 20 myself --21 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That begged clarity. I'm not sure that we'll be able to discover that 22 23 today. MR. MARKOVITZ: Let me respond to the 24

25

question of this board vs. That jury. I don't

think that this board is nullifying, or would nullify the jury's verdict if it granted commutation. I think the premis is a little bit off center.

years in prison on that verdict, and you cannot undo one day of that. Second, commutation would still leave him a convicted murderer. Even if he was released tomorrow, based on what you, and the Governor and then the board, what the parole board would do, we would still, we have a litigation pending with regard to that conviction for murder, and we would still continue to pursue that litigation. So, it is not that you're saying, at least officially, he's not a murderer. That may be a calculation you're making in reaching your decision on commutation --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You may be getting to the heart of it, and that is I think the board would be, the board is hungry to discover in any case of this nature, incontrovertable evidence --

MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, let me -LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: And that has been

Elusive to this moment.

2

MR. MARKOVITZ: That's why --

3

question, why give so much weight to that

5

declaration, and perhaps wasn't able to finish

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That's why the

6

it. I'm asking what is it that you can provide

that is compelling to us as an interested caring

7

board about fairness and justice, and being

9

mindful of the fact that 12 Pennsylvanians

10

sentenced him to life plus 30, that somehow it

11

disproves his participation in it.

12

MR. MARKOVITZ: Lieutenant Governor, first

of all, the jury has not sentenced anybody. He

13

was sentenced by Judge Ziggler, who has been

14

asking for ten years of this board to release

15 16

him. The jury convicted. The jury did not

17

sentence. It may be a small point to you, but

1.8

I want to make that point.

19

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We know that,

20

Mr. Markovitz.

21

MR. MARKOVITZ: This is what I was trying

22

to get to before. When you say, show us

23

incontrovertable evidence. You know, it becomes

24

a philosophical question. If, let's say that

25

you were 75 percent convinced that he didn't do

13

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it, and the man has spent 23 years in prison.

Do you, and I assume that 75 percent would not be incontrovertable, if that is what you mean by the word incontrovertable, do you allow him to remain in prison the rest of his life?

You see, in my mind, by my sense of justice, if I felt that a man more likely than not didn't do the murder and has spent 23 years in prison, that is to say if I felt that he was 51 percent, that it was 51 percent likely that he didn't do the murder, and he spent 23 years in prison, I let him out. That's my sense of justice, and of us has to decide that for each one himself. And so I pose again the question to you, Lieutenant Governor.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay.

MR. MARKOVITZ: If a man is, if you feel that there is a 75 percent chance that Zeek Goldblum didn't kill George Wilhelm and he's already done 23 years in prison, what do you do?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. Fair enough.

WARDEN: Mr. Markovitz, one of your other major issues that you brought up were the forensic specialists that were called in, and, obviously, they are known world wide. However,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

again, there was a qualification given in these testimonies here, and particularly, and, specifically, I'm referring to Henry Lee the forensic specialist. He prefaces all of his comments, and I'll quote this, it says, in this case the complete police investigation file and the original crime scene photographs, including the negatives, were reported missing. Without those materials, a complete re-analysis of the crime scene and reconstruction of the crime is almost impossible.

Then he goes on to say that he examined what was available, and then based on what was available, he then makes his statement.

MR. MARKOVITZ: With reasonable scientific certainty.

WARDEN: Correct.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, again --

WARDEN: There's a large piece of this

puzzle, when you're talking original

investigations and files and photographs, that's

a major piece of the puzzle here. And I'm not

saying that, you know, these guys are

respectfully, are known world wide, but when

they preface their comments with, we don't have

25

all of the information, but the pieces that we do have are going to say this, I can't give that a hundred percent credibility.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Understood.

WARDEN: That's the way he prefaces.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Understood. Although he did state with reasonable scientific certainty. And I would just ask that you consider what he based his opinion on --

WARDEN: And I do.

MR. MARKOVITZ: -- which is the blood splatter. You know, if you were a prosecuter or a police officer, and you came to me and you said, Mr. Markovitz, we want to investigate your business dealings for possible criminal activity, and we know that you have three sets, three separate sets of business records under three separate supervisions located in three different places and we'd like to see them. And I came back to you as the prosecutor, or the investigating officer, and I said, you know what, they're all gone. And you said to me, what do you mean, they're all gone? All three are gone? Yes, they're all gone. Why? How did they all turn out missing? Don't know. No explanation.

I would suggest to you if you were a police officer or a prosecutor, that you would not accept that without some suspicion.

WARDEN: Interesting point.

MR. MARKOVITZ: This was a case that was a very high profile case in Pittsburgh. At the time that the case was tried, ironically, I was living here. I was working in this building, but I remember hearing about this case nevertheless. The jury was sequestered the entire trial. Very unusual. It was a big time case.

WARDEN: What's your point here?

MR. MARKOVITZ: All of the files are gone. The complete homicide file is gone, the crime unit file is gone, the coroner's file is gone. Look at the circumstances under which the coroner's file is gone. The coroner's file was there as of about two months before Cyril Wecht resumed being coroner a couple of years ago.

WARDEN: All right. I think we understood your point.

MR. MARKOVITZ: So, you're saying, oh,
Henry Lee doesn't have these files. Yes. But,
where are these files? Are we to be penalized

for that? We're not incharge of the custody of 1 these files, and, frankly, I think it is very 3 suspicious that all three files are gone. WARDEN: It may be suspicious but it's a 5 separate issue. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me wrap up this 6 moment here and, I can't resolve that, and I think that you're smart enough to know that that 9 belongs in another forum, not the Board of 10 Pardons. 11 So, where do we go from here? You've got twenty minutes left. 12 MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, I was going to attempt 13 to call Mr. Dixon, and I think that you would 14 all like to hear him. He's the prosecutor. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay. Thank you. 16 MR. MARKOVITZ: Thank you. 17 MR. DIXON: Good morning. Governor 18 Schweiker, Honorable Members of the board. My 19 name is Ed Peter Dixon and I prosecuted this 20 case. I lived with this case for months, and 21 22 recently when I was called in for a deposition 23 by defense counsel in an ancillary matter in this case, he asked if I would review the trans-24 cript and make a determination, looking back 25

over the years, looking at the whole case from this perspective as to whether there was any injustice, whether there was any irregularity, whether there was anything in the trial of this case that indicated that there was an ufair result. I had very little hope or feeling or expectation that I would find any such, but I had declared to counsel that I had always conducted myself in the hundred or so motor trials that I have prosecuted over seven years that if I found such, I would let it be known. As, indeed, I have dismissed murder charges in the past when I found that to be necessary for what is wise and just.

And, when I agreed to review the transcript, he said, fine, and he hands me a box with 18 volumes and 5,000 pages, and I said, 18 volumes? He said, well, you did most of the talking. I will be more brief today.

LIEURTENATHT GOVERNOR: That's encouraging.

MR. DIXON: That is an idea though of the magnitude of this case. And what I have found in that review are as follows. Number one, I am convinced that Charles Goldblum did not participate in any active way in the murder of

1	George Wilhelm.
2	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Why?
3	MR. DIXON: I will get to that. I just
4	want to give you the three points.
5	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let's get this.
6	You've got less than 20 minutes.
7	MR. DIXON: I won't need all of that.
8	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You don't have 20
9	minutes.
10	MR. DIXON: I understand.
11	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The balance of the
12	supporters do.
13	MR. DIXON: He did not participate in the
14	murder of George Wilhelm for this reason.
15	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Why?
16	MR. DIXON: Because he did not participate
17	in the land fraud. The Commonwealth's theory of
18	the case is this.
19	MR. FISHER: No. Physically. Mechanically
20	And from the back seat of the car, why should
21	we accept your depiction, that he could have
22	not, your word, participate in the murder?
23	MR. DIXON: Because he had no motive. And
24	he had nothing to gain from the murder of
25	George Wilhelm. And that is tied into the 17

uncontrovertable, undisputed facts with regard to the conclusion that I drew that he had no motive. He had nothing to gain because he was not involved in the land fraud. And these are the 17 reasons. And, I'll just read them off. They're uncontroverted, undisputed.

Number 1, it was only Dido and Miller who were the people who carried out the land fraud. Every witness testified that Dido and Miller, no witness ever testified in this case, other than Clarence Miller, whose testimony is in dispute, no witness ever put Charles Goldblum in Washington, D.C. when this money passed.

No witness ever put Charles Goldblum in Washington, PA when money passed. So, he's not in any of these meetings. His fingerprints are not on the document of the deed. His typewriter did not type the deed, but rather Dido's typewriter. That was the scientific evidence.

Mr. Goldblum was not named in the FBI complaint. Here's George Wilhelm so enranged now that he's been defrauded. He goes to the FBI. Now what is the reasonable expectation that he's going to give the FBI all of the information, particularly, all of the names of

23

24

25

the culprits who have defrauded him? He names Clarence Miller and Dido. Does he name Charles Goldblum? No. And then when he goes back to withdraw the complaint, does he say anything about Charles Goldblum? No. Is Charles Goldblum present when the affidavit is made withdrawing the FBI complaint? No. He's in West Weston, Virginia, which is undisputed and in the evidence. Further, the North Carolina, personal close friend of the victim who saw everyone who came to North Carolina, named Dido and named Miller but he never named Charles Goldblum as ever coming to North Carolina. had no knowledge of Charles Goldblum in this matter of the land fraud.

Furthermore, the theory of the Commonwealth, which I see now was erroneous, was that Goldblum was the mastermind. He was the shadowy figure in the back who had planned and executed and the persons he sent out were Dido and Miller. But this doesn't hold water, for this reason. If he spends all of these months as the mastermind, the cloudy figure behind the curtain, he's not able to be identified by the victim, then why does he come and reveal himself to the

victim, be introduced, my name is Charles

Goldblum, the day before his murder. This is

uncontroverted.

At the McDonald's meeting, Miller says, this is my lawyer, Charles Goldblum. They sit down, and what do the discuss? The land fraud. The next day they meet again. Whose there? Charles Goldblum. Is this Mr. Smith? No. This is Charles Goldblum. So, if he's the shadowy figure all of these months, if he was really involved in the land fraud, why in the world does he now, of all times, when the thing is falling apart and the money can't be repaid, why does he come and reveal his identity to the victim? What is to be expected? The victim (first side of tape ends.)

The Commonwealth theory was, because he was involved in the land fraud he burns down his restaurant to get the money to pay the victim, but, there is one significant fact that nobody has talked about that destroys that theory, and I never saw it until I reviewed it, and that is this. The uncontroverted, undisputed evidence is that the insurance company a month before the murder offered Charles Goldblum \$40,000 under

2.4

his personal property business insurance. All he had to pay the victim if he was involved in the land fraud was \$20,000. Charles Goldblum turned down the \$40,000 offer. At the same time, the insurance company offered his parents \$145,000.

If Charles Goldblum was desperate for money because he was involved in the land fraud, so desperate that he was going to burn down his restaurant and murder a man, wouldn't he have said, thank God, I'll take the \$40,000. Here, Wilhelm, is your money, the matter is over.

You see it doesn't fit. It doesn't fit. And I see it,

He doesn't have a motive once the land fraud falls. Don't you see it's a house of cards? Without the land fraud, if Charles Goldblum is not involved in cheating the victim in this case, he has no motive to murder the man.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay.

MR. DIXON: He has no motive and nothing to benefit.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me interrupt you.

Does Anyone have any questions at this point?

MS. WILLIAMS: I have a question. 1 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Go ahead. 2 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Dixon, you're giving us 3 this information, of course, that you read after 4 the fact. 5 MR. DIXON: Yes. 6 MS. WILLIAMS: And you were the prosecutor 7 in this case, are you saying that you did not 8 have that information available to you before? 9 MR. DIXON: When I began this case, you 10 begin with what you have at the beginning. That 11 was my theory at the beginning. I did not know 12 all of the evidence that would develope during 13 the case. And, indeed, my job was simply to 14 present what I had. My job wasn't the jury. 15 I wasn't there to decide whether this is 16 sufficient or whether this is a viable case or 17 not. So I presented what I had. 18 MS. WILLIAMS: You did not have --19 MR. DIXON: Now, in retrospect --20 MS. WILLIAMS: Is that your answer, that 21 you did not have that information? 22 MR. DIXON: I did not have all of the 23 information that I've had now when I reviewed 24 the testimony. 25

MS. WILLIAMS: Would you have proceeded in his prosecution?

MR. DIXON: No. And the other thing that I must mention to you, please, is that the significance along with this is, not only did he not have any motive or nothing to gain from the murder, but he did not receive a fair trial. And the reason that he did not receive a fair trial was, that he begged the court, through his counsel, on the record, please let me call Thadius Dido. He's the only person in the world who can prove that I didn't have anything to do with the land fraud. Dido was the only person he had to call. The key witness.

Now, under Virgin Islands vs. Smith, and even back in '73 under Chambers vs. Mississippi, the court has held in the United States and in this state that when a man is in a capital murder case, every effort must be given under the due process clause to give him an opportunity to call witnesses in his defense.

What is more fundamental to fairness? Who was the key witness? The only person in the world who he could call? Mr. Dido was in court. His lawyer was in court. He advised defense counsel,

1	and it is on the record before the court, and I
2	was there, he said Dido will testify in my favor
3	and support me that I was not involved in the
4	land fraud. The court turned him down.
5	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon, you're
6	Louise, are you
7	MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.
8	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Do you have your
9	answer?
10	MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.
11	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Warden.
12	WARDEN GILOTTI: You're not denying that
13	Mr. Goldblum wasn't involved in the arson, is
14	that correct?
15	MR. DIXON: I admit that he was in the
16	arson. There is no question about it, and he
17	admits it.
18	WARDEN GILOTTI: And you also know that
19	Mr. Goldblum lied for many years about that?
20	MR. DIXON: Yes, he did. And he admitted
21	that.
22	WARDEN GILOTI: He admitted that many,
23	man y y ears
24	MR. DIXON: That's right. And he's paid
25	for it with 23 years of his life.

WARDEN GILOTTI: Well, that has to roll 1 in with part of the issues here. His constant lving --3 MR. DIXON: Well, see, that a person might 4 lie doesn't mean that he would murder. 5 WARDEN GILOTTI: This is the same man who 6 tried to hire an undercover police officer to 7 do it. 8 MR. DIXON: Absolutely right. But that 9 doesn't mean that he murdered this man. You 10 have to still show me a motive that he had to 11 kill George Wilhelm. Where's the motive? What 12 did he have to gain? He's a lawyer --13 WARDEN GILOTTI: It ties back into the 14 arson which he denied for multiple years. 15 MR. DIXON: But that doesn't prove that he 16 murdered this man. All it proves is that he 17 was an arsonist and he lied about the arson. It 18 doesn't prove that he murdered the man. We're 19 here to talk about, did he kill the man? I say 20 he didn't. 21 MR. FISHER: Mr. Dixon, we have your out-22 look. We have your opinion. You've just made 23 that clear. And you're a smart guy to say it the 24 second time. And you know where that kind of 25

1	information and outlook belongs formally speaking.
2	MR. DIXON: Pardon me?
3	MR. FISHER: You know where that kind of
4	presentation belongs, and it's not the Board of
5	Pardons.
6	MR. DIXON: Oh, no. I disagree.
7	MR. FISHER: We care. But whether or not
8	MR. DIXON: I disagree, and let me tell
9	you why.
10	MR. FISHER: No. Mr. Dixon
11	MR. DIXON: Please. The law
12	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon. Mr. Dixon.
13	It is my obligation to manage the atmosphere and
14	the affairs of this Board of Pardons. If you
15	have something to say in conclusion
16	MR. DIXON: One sentence.
17	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Say it.
18	MR. DIXON: Yes. The law of courts give no
19	relief to Charles Goldblum because the issues
20	that I have raised here are waived and if he does
21	win a new trial, thadius Dido is dead. He cannot
22	be called.
23	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay.
24	MR. FISHER: One question, Mr. Dixon. Who
25	burned down the restaurant?

MR. DIXON: Clarence Miller burned down the 1 restaurant at the behest of Charles Goldblum. 2 MR. FISHER: How do you know that? 3 MR. DIXON: Because the evidence indicates 4 that its undisputed, and in fact it is stipulated 5 on the record that George Wilhelm was not ever 6 engaged in any criminal activity because Clarence Miller was seen at the scene of the arson both 8 at 2 o'clock and 2:30 the afternoon of the fire 9 and when the restaurant closed at 5 o'clock 10 George Wilhelm was never seen on the premisis. 11 That's why. 12 MR. FISHER: You're familiar with the fact 13 that that is not the testimony that appeared in 14 the record? 15 MR. DIXON: Clarence Miller testified --16 he tried to blame George Wilhelm. 17 MR. FISHER: He was your witness, was he not? 18 MR. DIXON: Yeah, but I told the jury, and 19 believe me, it was reminded to me by counsel, 20 I told the jury for the first time in my career, 21 you can't believe everything Clarence Miller 22 says. I never attacked my own star witness in 23 my life until Clarence Miller, but I said, you 24 can't believe everything that this man says.

25

You have to test him. In fact, in cross examination Dave Rothman put up 50 black marks on the board against Clarence Miller, and when he was finished I said, there's some more, isn't there, Clarence? Clarence said, yeah, I did more bad things. We put up another half dozen bad things. The guy was the sleeze ball of the world. My one and only star witness. I told this jury, you've got this kind of a character, look for confirmation.

And I say to you this, and I mean it with all of my heart, if Mr. Goldblum had the opportunity to call Mr. Dido and Mr. Dido would have said, Clarence Miller is a liar. He was never involved in the land fraud, the jury verdict would have been different. That's why I'm here.

MR. FISHER: But Mr. Goldblum also had the opportunity to tell the truth at that trial, didn't he?

MR. DIXON: He made a lot of mistakes, but we're here to decide one thing. Did he kill the man? And, no, he did not, in my view.

MR. FISHER: No, I think. I'd modify that, Mr. Dixon, and that's whether or not commutation

1	is justified.
2	MR. DIXON: But doesn't that depend?
3	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I think you know
4	better. Okay. You can take your place.
5	MR. DIXON: Thank you.
6	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. We've got
7	about five more minutes. And, Mr. Markovitz,
8	it's your choice.
9	MR. MARKOVITZ: I would like the board to
10	hear from Rabbi and Mrs. Goldblum.
11	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Absolutely. Thank you
12	Good morning, Rabbi.
13	RABBI GOLDBLUM: Good morning.
14	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I'm sure these are
15	difficult moments for you, and we respect that
16	as the father of the inmate. And with that,
17	this is your time.
18	RABBI GOLDBLUM: Thank you. Ms. Williams,
19	and Gentlemen of the Board of Pardons, we are
20	here to ask you to give us back our son after
21	almost 23 years. We are mindful of what Charles
22	did wrong. We know that he broke the law and
23	made some mistakes, but murder with a penalty
24	of imprisonment for his entire lifetime was not
25	one of his crimes.

Notable judiciaries and authorities have courageously stepped forward to convey their belief that his murder conviction was, and I quote, "a miscarriage of justice". In fact, those who are in a position to know best, the judge, the prosecuting attorney who spoke so well this morning, the coroner and many forensic experts, have all stated their firm belief that our son did not commit the crime for which is sentence was imposed.

The victim himself made a dying declaration that you already know, naming the assailant who stabbed him, and it was not our son.

I am now 79 years old and my wife is 75.

We desperately need to bring our son out of confinement during our lifetime. We have visited Charles, Zeek to his family, about as many times as the regulations allow. Our children and grandchildren have been to visit him many times. Our grandchildren know who Zeek is and why he is confined. When Zeek comes out, he can live with us, or any, with any of his siblings. We all want him to be with us. Charles' sister, a physician, and her husband, also a physician, want very much to share their

22

23

24

25

home in Baltimore with him and to assist with his adjustment to freedom, so do his brothers. Simeon, a full professor of medicine in the University of Maryland, University of Maryland Medical School, as well as David, who is a Major in the Air Force Reserves, and an Environmental Expert in the armed services. Our daughter, Ora, who is a director of an adoption agency in Israel, along with her husband, an emminent rheumatologist, would welcome him to live with They feel that his talents, that with his them. talents, he would be an asset to the adoption agency. In addition, my wife and I would feel virtually redeemed to have Zeek be with us in our home in Dover, Delaware, where I serve as a Rabbi.

Our son's behaviour for the past 22 years shows that he does not present a danger to society. He has more than one firm offer for a steady job for life from longtime friends. In addition, we will do whatever is necessary to help him if he seeks to further his education. With this kind of support, this kind of a support system, he would be, indeed, a very responsible tax paying citizen, productive, making

contributions to society instead of being a 1 burden to the state. 2 Please take it to your hearts to consider 3 seriously what has been presented to you today. 4 The bible reminds us of the legal obligation of justice, justice shall you pursue. The great sages justify the double expression of justice. 7 justice to remind us that we must pursue justice with justice. In the more than 20 years that 9 Charles has been imprisoned, justice has 10 certainly been done. Has certainly been served. 11 In the waining years of our lives, we would be 12 forever thankful if you would give us back our 13 son. 14 Thank you. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you, Rabbi. Do 16 the board members have any questions? 17 Thank you, Rabbi. 18 you can take your place. 19 Mrs. Goldblum, do you care to comment? You 20 would have to come up here if you do. This is 21 being recorded. 2.2 Good morning. 23 MRS. GOLDBLUM: Good morning. I want to 24 reiterate what my husband has said --25

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mrs. Goldblum, may I 1 gently ask that you address the board? 2 MRS. GOLDBLUM: And I would just like 3 to introduce our children. 4 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mrs. Goldblum --5 MRS. GOLDBLUM: That's all that I want to 6 do. 7 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Go ahead. 8 MRS. GOLDBLUM: Simeon, would you please 9 stand. That's our oldest son. Charles is our 10 second son. David, our third son, Liba and 11 her husband is here too. Liba, please stand, 12 Our youngest son. Ora had come from Isreal 13 because originally this hearing was set for 14 April the 8th, and it was just too difficult 15 for her to come back when we changed the date of 16 the hearing, and I certainly hope that you will 17 take to heart what my husband has requested. 18 Thank you. 19 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. We're 20 going to finish up. Anyone here --21 Mr. Markovitz, this is your time. Anything else 22 that you would like to say to conclude? 23 MR. MARKOVITZ: Well, no. I was wondering 24 -- I don't know what the other side is going to 25

1.6

say. If there is a rebuttal process here. If so, I would reserve my time for rebuttal.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Were not bound by the rules that you expected as a relation to conduct of a court. Obviously, if the chair judges, or the court believes that something warrants clarity, and in the interest of fairness, you'll have the opportunity to raise the question, by all means.

MR. MARKOVITZ: Thank you. And, again, thank you for having the hearing.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. And let me, I think it's appropriate to acknowledge former United States Senator Boshwitz. I know that you travelled a great distance to attend this morning, and the record will reflect your attendence, and we appreciate your interest. Thank you.

That concludes those who support the idea of commutation, and now we will move to a phase where we will hear from an assistant district attorney of Allegheny County who opposes the idea of commutation. You have watched the proceedings, so the microphone and the floor is yours, and we will have questions and

observations. 1 Can we have your name for the record? 2 MR. GILMORE: Yes. May it please the board. 3 My name is Jim Gilmore, Assistant District 4 Attorney from Allegheny County. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Absolutely. 6 7 time is yours. MR. GILMORE: Thank you. If the board would understand, basically, I can't give a 9 first-hand knowledge of the case, I can tell 10 you what I believe. For 23 years all of the 11 courts have ruled against these claims. 12 I would like to take one brief moment to 13 introduce Earl Wilhelm, who is the brother of 14 the victim, and Mrs. Wilhelm --15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Gilmore --1.6 MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry, I'll stay closer. 17 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: -- comments should 18 be addressed to the chair and the board and only 19 if there are acknowledgements that are 20 appropriate, the chair will certainly do that. 21 Let me ask you, knowing that we're going 22 to afford you, if necessary, equivalent time. 23 Do you have individuals who you will have 24 address the board? 25

MR. GILMORE: Yes. I believe Earl Wilhelm, the brother of the victim will certainly want to testify.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The brother. Anyone else? May I ask a show of hands is there anyone here -- just a moment. Stay right there.

MR. GILMORE: I believe that's it. I'm not sure if the mother would want to.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. And let me ask, anyone here who intends to request of the board the opportunity to speak who opposes the commutation, just a show of hands. Okay. So we have two individuals including yourself.

So, the time is yours, Mr. Gilmore.

MR. GILMORE: Thank you. Basically, what's happened here, there was a lot of evidence in this trial. The jury was presented with overwhelming evidence in my belief, and they did conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that three crimes were committed, the land fraud, the arson, and the murder. And what they've done, throughout the years, while a lot of the evidence was presented by Clarence Miller's testimony, there are corroborating evidence of his testimony and other witnesses presented.

25

But what they've essentially done with three state appeals and one federal appeal, is that they've been attacking the credibility of Clarence Miller. So, I would conclude that you can conclude that there was never really a claim of insufficient evidence in this case, even on appeal to supreme court in the initial direct appeal, the sufficiency of the evidence argument was more of a weight of the evidence argument. It was an attack on the credibility of Clarence Miller. So there's more than enough evidence to conclude that he committed the crime of murder, but what they've done is they tried to attack Clarence Miller's credibility numerous ways throughout the years, all of which have been rejected. And so what that ends up telling you is, they're asking you to re-weigh the evidence that the jury basically had before it and weighed, and they tried to put different twists on that. And I don't believe that is reason for commutation, and it certainly has not been reason for relief from the courts, both the state courts and the federal courts. did get full federal review to the third circuit, under which, which is rather unusual.

That is purely disgressional on their part.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: What was their conclusion?

MR. GILMORE: Their conclusion was that there was sufficient evidence, and that the credibility of Clarence Miller under the various attacks had been raised, have never been a due process violation in effect, that he was uncredible, inconsistent or in some fashion, grounds for a new trial or for any reason for a disposing of, or a disgarding the verdict that was rendered by the jury.

Now, different things can be said about this case but one of the most validating things that is present in the case that makes what Clarence Miller says truthful was the very actions of Charles Goldblum. What he did when he solicited an undercover detective that he didn't know was undercover, to kill the lead witness before trial, Clarence Miller, for \$2,000. What he did that wasn't just a crime of solicitation to commit murder, that was an affirmance that what Clarence Miller was saying was truthful, and I think the board should do it that way. That's what Goldblum

does that verifies what Clarence Miller was 1 2 saying. His story to the jury and his story 3 throughout was, I never knew what was going to 4 happen. I'm sitting in the back seat, this 5 horrible murder starts to occur from the front 6 seat, and I'm astounded. I freeze. I lose it. 7 I can't react. I don't help. I don't do 8 anything. 9 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That is, what? The 10 characterization of the defense? 11 MR. GILMORE: That is the characterization 12 of Goldblum of why -- he can't say that he wasn't 13 in the back seat, although I would think that 14 he would try to if he could, but the evidence 15 is clear. 16 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I believe that is 17 acknowledged. 1.8 MR. GILMORE: Correct. But what I'm saying 19 is, his defense is, I couldn't react. I froze. 20 But the fact is --21 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: But the fact is --22 just for the record, for clarity's sake, 23 Goldblum himself during our two hour interview 24 confirmed that. 2.5

MR. GILMORE: Correct. But what I believe the solicitation to commit the murder of Clarence Miller shows you is that he is a pre-meditated type of killer. That he is willing to take a human life, and he can't try to discard that.

He claims that he lost it there and he was just hiring somebody because he wasn't thinking rationally, but athat isn't what it shows. It shows you that He is a man capable of killing. In fact, after being charged and everything else that occurred in this case and awaiting trial, if he were truly a type of person who wasn't into pre-meditated killing, he would not have solicited someone else to kill. That's why I would submit to you, that his solicitation to kill was call it -- an essential way of affirming what Clarence Miller says.

Now there's a number of other witnesses to testify, and I'll very briefly note that they testified to various aspects of the land fraud, the arson and to the murder, and the corroborate things Miller says. Obviously what Miller is saying, some of the things, there is nobody else who can testify to that because they're not present, other than Goldblum, the victim is

25

dead, but these additional, rest of people, Bill Hill who was president of the steel haulers, he was a friend of Wilhelm. He varified that 1974 he knew that the victim, Wilhelm, was getting into a land deal in North Carolina and that an Attorney Goldblum was involved. Renee Williams was a rebuttal witness, and she was a prostitute who testified to aspects of Miller's testimony, how the men involved in the arson, including Charles Goldblum, had met at a house of prostitution, and she varified aspects of Miller's testimony there. fire chief, Dudak, basically verified how the arson was committed, and he verifies the way Miller says things were done, which Miller, basically tells how the holes in the wall were done, and how the acelerant was used. Matts who was a receptionist at Arthur Young. She testifies how a man called for Goldblum, where he worked at Arthur Young and Associates, and basically said that he was the Torch, and this was after the fire, before the murder, he was receiving calls. This is why Goldblum had an equal reason to kill outside of the land He was going to be perhaps exposed as

23

24

25

an arsonist by the victim, Wilhelm, and that's one of the reasons, that's the second reason why. It isn't a one reason case for killing, it's two reasons. It is both the land fraud and the arson. And the victim was involved in trying to maybe expose Goldblum's involvement there, and that's why he was silenced.

And then lastly, a man named Richard Karutz (phonetic), he corroborates Miller's account as to what actually occurred on the top floor of this parking garage. Karutz gets off of the elevator going to his car to drive home the night of the murder. He hears a thud. He looks to his left as he exits the elevator and he sees two men standing over by the wall of the garage, and he can't identify them. can give general descriptions, which in the end wind up matching Clarence Miller and to a degree, Goldblum. And what he's able to say is that they're acting nonchalantly, they are standing there, no one's panicked like Goldblum would indicate, and they're both by the wall, where, in the end, the body was found discarded. What happened was, the victim, unfortunately --

MR. FISHER: He had no -- that witness had

no prior relationship with either --1 MR. GILMORE: Absolutely not. 2 MR. FISHER: -- of those two individuals 3 or anyone involved --MR. GILMORE: Correct. He's just a man 5 going to his car. Basically, he was a 29 year 6 old steel worker and he was just going to his 7 car that night. And, he doesn't have a 8 lengthly contact, he doesn't talk to them or 9 anything, he sees them look at him and he makes 10 it to his car, walks right to it, gets in and 11 proceeds to pull out, but he does notice that 1.2 they walk away together. So what I'm saying, 13 that corroborates Miller's version that they 14 were up there on the garage and it didn't look 15 like Goldblum is frantic as he says he was. 16 He wasn't frozen. He was actually participating 17 in some respect. These are small tangential 18 things, but the totality of the circumstance, 19 it all adds up. 20 All of this was presented to the supreme 21 court in briefs. All of this was presented to a 22 jury. All of this was basically weighed and 23 found to be why Miller's testimony, the supreme 24 court of Pennsylvania says it's credible and 25

consistent with the outside facts that were introduced, and, it is internally consistent. He did not trip himself up despite gruelling cross examination by one of the ablest defense attorneys of his day, H.J. Rothman, who Judge Ziggler praises in his opinion. And I noted that to the board in my letter.

Now the reason that I touch on all of that is the board is hearing that he is an innocent man, and I believe the board, as General Fisher has indicated, knows that that should not be necessarily the issue that should be before it, before it, but that is the issue that they place before this board.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I didn't hear you.

MR. GILMORE: I believe that the Attorney General was correct, that they had phrased this issue that he is innocent and that you should let him out for that reason. I believe that is clear, that he is not innocent. He was proven beyond a reasonable doubt, and for that reason, I believe, there is no need for this board to give any merit to their claim, and that they had chosen the route that they have gone. He has perjured himself, which is a self-serving

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

perjury, by only admitting to the arson, in hopes to seemingly come clean, I believe.

Now, there's a few points that I would touch upon also. I know that they say, the dying declaration, Clarence, Clarence Miller did this to me, is very daming against Clarence Miller, obviously, which we did get a first degree conviction on, but somehow exhonorates Goldblum.

My reading of this record is clear that the connections that Wilhelm ever had with Goldblum were not very direct. He was the mastermind behind the land fraud, the arson, and then the murder. He purposely, and he thought cleverly, stayed away from Wilhelm who he viewed as the pigeon in the land fraud and his ultimate victim until the moment that he had to carry out the murder himself because he couldn't get anyone else to do it probably. And, quite frankly, he had every motive to kill Mr. Wilhelm, and the fact that Clarence Miller is who Wilhelm indicates, it is very understandable because he doesn't know Goldblum well, but he knows Clarence Miller. He's known him for many, many years. Childhood friends. He has been butchered with

25 to 27 cuts. They throw him over the edge.

Not to dispose of the body so no one will ever find it, but I would submit to finish him off.

As luck would have it, Mr. Wilhelm lands on a walkway between what was Gimbel's Department

Store and the parking garage. This was a garage at the time. Gimbel's is out of business but they connect them. He only falls one story and hits the walkway. If he would have fallen seven stories, we would certainly have never gotten a response out of Mr. Wilhelm or a dying declaration.

They can't -- the police can't even get to him immediately when the parking attendant figures out where he is. It takes them a while to get over the fencing that would keep anybody from getting out on top of this room and not hurting themselves. It is just a normal safety precaution. They had trouble getting him off of there. So he is alive for a period of time and have to transport him out. He is extremely upset. He knows he's dying. He keeps saying this to the police officer. I believe that he's not fully rational. He cannot give a detailed response. In fact, the police officer

testified, Officer Bobicky (phonetic), that he did not try to get him to say who did this to me. He wasn't even trying to get the details. He was trying to keep the man calm in an effort so that he wouldn't bleed to death any quicker.

And the fact that he said, Clarence Miller did this to me, I would submit that it is simply because he knows Clarence Miller, that's who is coming to mind in his last dying moments. And, there is no doubt that Clarence Miller did do this to him, but as an accomplice with Mr. Goldblum.

So that's my explanation with regards to dying declaration and the point of the matter is under the law of accomplice liability certainly is adequate. The jury was instructed on an accomplice liability, and that's why his claim of innocence fails there and I believe that there was sufficient evidence.

Now, turning to the other major aspect is the forensic evidence that they're now offering. The only reason that they can have forensic experts do anything about this case at this time, 22 years later, is that they've read the candid testimony of the chief investigating

24

25

officer, Detective Ronald Freeman who is now Commander Freeman of the Allegheny County Police. And, Detective Freeman, under gruelling cross examination by Attorney Rothman doesn't hide a thing. He states that there are no photographs of the dashboard, apparently that were never There were photographs taken of the crime scene, but that was not taken. provides us with everything the photograph would have told us. He tells, in his mind, everything that he could remember about the blood droplets on the dashboard, and he even is willing to agree with Attorney Rothman that perhaps, and that certainly the blood droplets would indicate that maybe Clarence Miller, as to that aspect of the assault is uncredible, and manufacturing that or lying as to who was really the blame at that moment inside the vehicle. That was all put forth to the jury and the jury was aware of that.

Attorney Rothman was quite effective. He didn't have to present forensic pathologists, or he presented the Commonwealth's own witness, and he even brought home with Dr. Joshua Furpura, who was the Chief Pathologist at the time, and working for Dr. Wecht, and he basically had him

also indicate that to the jury and he made very good use of that. But that was -- what they're doing is, they're centering on a very small aspect of the pathology and the investigation to claim innocence at this point. And that very matter was given to the jury, sir.

MR. FISHER: You're referring to the two forensic scientists that were on the video?

MR. GILMORE: Correct. Dr. Henry Lee and Dr. Cyril Wecht. What they're doing is --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me point out for the record, as well as those assembled, that each board member did view the video from beginning to end, both of them provided by those forensic scientists.

MR. GILMORE: I have not viewed those videos. I have seen the depositions and I've seen their pleadings in the court, and I understand their concern. And I believe that Dr. Lee is very forthright in saying that he can't come to the conclusions that he would like because he can't be provided with all of the materials. That he would like to do an absolute view of this.

I will say this, this case is old. This

case was given full discovery at the time, the defense had everything that they were talking about now. All of the files were made available to them. They've used them over the years. I don't know what happened to the defense attorney's copies. They've had many attorneys come in on the case. I don't know if they're on their seventh or eighth, or which attorney they're on right now.

When this case came into my review about four years ago, I bent over backwards to hand them copies of the police files, copies of everything that we could find in the D.A.'s file, because they were raising these issues before a Post Conviction Relief Act, and the fact that other agencies don't have their files anymore, doesn't mean that it's the fault of anyone in particular, or that there is some sort of devious -- any wonder that can be raised from this.

What I would submit is, just like the Post Conviction Relief Act provides, staleness is grounds for a noncognizable claim. That is a reason for them not to get relief. That is in the Post Conviction Relief Act, and ultimately I

1

2

think that the district attorney's office should be able to prevail on that, although we never had to get quite that far. The case -- these issues have been ruled previously litigated because the very essence of Detective Freeman's testimony has been raised in the past at two different times and have been ruled upon by the courts and they just didn't buy it. What they're doing is, they're putting a twist on it. by adding now what they call expert evidence, which you're calling after discovered evidence, which I pointed out to the courts is not after discovered evidence under the applicable tests and can never be used that way. In fact, the essence is, they're attacking the credibility of Miller, what they call after discovered evidence, and the third prong of an after discovered evidence test is, you can't use after discovered evidence for credibility purposes alone. In fact, that is what Commonwealth vs. Goldblum, the supreme court decision is most cited for by attorneys.

If you're looking for that principle, you cite the Goldblum, and they use that saying that Miller's testimony based on another attack

that they're no longer pursuing, based on 1 psychological evaluations that they had done 3 of Clarence Miller, post to trial, could not be used. It is not true after discovered evidence. In fact, nothing is after discovered here because it was all there at trial, and that's 6 why I'm saying --7 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Discovered here. 8 9 vou mean? 10 MR. GILMORE: Yes. Nothing has been discovered post trial. These experts are not 11 12 doing anything new that has been discovered after trial. 13 They're just rendering an opinion based on 14 15 things that were presented to the jury. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Well, you know this 16 court is -- without the ability to weigh and give 17 -- well, to give weight to assertion such --18 observations such as yours, and the same goes for 19 what's been provided by supporters of commutation. 20 We're just without the --21 MR. GILMORE: I understand --22 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: -- to confirm such 23 24 things, and I think it brings an important

point, that perhaps some of these things should

25

be litigated. But, where? Where in the proper forum is the question that follows that remark. And, is it the Board of Pardons? Having said that, I thing General Fisher would like to question you.

MR. GILMORE: Yes.

GENERAL FISHER: Mr. Gilmore, let me ask you a couple of questions about the record.

The, I believe that you referred to both of these issues and I would like you to clarify them for us if you could.

Based on the record that you've reviewed, the record of the trial itself of Mr. Goldblum, what is your belief, what do you believe the record shows as to who was responsible for the actual arson of the restaurant?

MR. GILMORE: I think that it was clear that Mr. Goldblum committed the arson from the record. Mr. Miller's testimony is clear. The witnesses from the restaurant that Mr. Goldblum --

GENERAL FISHER: Mr. Goldblum's -- let me cut to the chase, Mr. Goldblum has already acknowledged to us --

MR. GILMORE: Correct.

GENERAL FISHER: -- that he paid for the

2

3

4

.

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

arson. What do you believe the record shows as to who the actual arsonist was?

MR. GILMORE: I believe that the actual arsonist was Mr. Goldblum in most respects. Mr. Miller may have been involved with some respects. I do not believe Mr. Wilhelm, the poor victim in this case, was the arsonist, based on my review, which is something that Miller tried to pin on him. I believe that Miller's testimony is self-serving. It was noted to the jury. It's always been said that way, that he may not be telling all of the truth. He is telling it in the colored mode and that he ends up getting a corrupt source charge from the defense attorney basically to let the jury be aware that he has every motive to lie because he's also trying to exhonorate himself. So, he's casting some blame on some other people. But, I believe that the record is pretty clear that Mr. Goldblum actually participated in the arson. He ushered the people who were the workers in this restaurant who actually were trying to decorate for the holidays. They wanted to stay after hours that night to decorate for the holiday season, and he actually ushered them

out, and that's why it was so vivid in their minds, and they testified, chiefly, Ray Corrigan and Edith Wilson, the manager, and the cook in the restaurant, and so that puts him right there as the last person in the restaurant, and he almost — he had explained to enough people that he was going to get to Sterno, and it was clearly an arson by all accounts. So, I've said there's no doubt. But he's admitting to that now because he can't get away from the arson. He's hoping that that will make him look semi-honest. I guess to this board at this time.

GENERAL FISHER: All right. What evidence is there in the record? You've made reference to Bill Hill's, I believe, testimony about Goldblum's involvement in the land deal. Tell me a little bit more about that testimony and what other evidence is there in the record at the Goldblum trial about Goldblum's involvement in the land deal?

MR. GILMORE: Basically, from Mr. Miller's testimony, it is evident, and I would submit, based on a lot of testimony that was given about Mr. Miller, he wasn't capable of drafting

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the legal documents that were involved. There was fake deeds drafted.

GENERAL FISHER: He was or wasn't?

MR. GILMORE: He was not capable of doing that. That is what Goldblum was doing in that matter. He was behind the scenes drafting up the phoney documents that would convince Earl — George Wilhelm that he was in fact getting land for his money.

They set it up purposely that he did not meet with Mr. Wilhelm. But the indications from Miller, and like I said, Bill Hill's testimony is that on more than one occasion Wilhelm mentioned the fact that he had a land deal. Bill Hill was a man who was running for office, I believe House of Representatives in the State of Pennsylvania, and he was more a political person, and what Clarence Miller did, often times, is he was attaching himself to people's coattails in his way to get ahead in life, and he thought Charles Goldblum would be an upcoming man some day, I guess, and he associated with him for that purpose. So he was involved in a lot of campaigns, as was the victim. He was involved in a lot of campaigns, and that's how

they knew Bill Hill.

So, what is important about Bill Hill is that he's completely disassociated with any motive to falsify, and he verifies what Miller is saying because he is getting it straight from the victim himself, Wilhelm, that a man named Goldblum was dealing with him. The receptionist is very important because she is verifying, she's independently verifying that a man is calling saying that he's the Torch, and what happened was, whether Mr. Wilhelm participated in the fire, I don't believe that he did, but he knew about the fire, and knew that Goldblum had done it. And, Mr. Wilhelm was mad. He wanted his money back from the land fraud. had been promised to get his money back, and he was willing to basically goad Mr. Goldblum into getting his money back by telling him that he might turn him in. And that is all verified by the independent receptionist.

GENERAL FISHER: The receptionist's testimony is that she identifies Wilhelm as the person who calls and identifies himself as the Torch?

MR. GILMORE: She can't identify Wilhelm.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

1.5

She confirms that a person is calling saying that he's the Torch. She can't identify who it is. So, this is circumstantial evidence corroborating that Miller's testimony that Goldblum is telling him, Wilhelm is bugging me at work.

What happens is, the calls then are put through and the receptionist doesn't hear all of the calls. So, no, there is not an actual verification as to who the caller was. And I admit that this is conjectual in part, but what he's asking for here, more so than the land fraud and the murder, is exhonoration -- I mean, the land fraud and the arson is exhonoration of the murder.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We understand that.

MR. GILMORE: And he can't get away from being in the back seat of the car.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We understand that.

I fully understand what the request is. Just one final question, please, from me. The pending appeal before the superior court on Judge O'Brien's denial of the Post Conviction Relief Act petition.

MR. GILMORE: Second post conviction

petition.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Second denial.

What's the -- what is the legal argument
currently before the superior court?

MR. GILMORE: They have pursued the forensic expert evidence argument in five or six different ways, and that is the main argument.

What Mr. Dixon got into, with regard to land fraud, is not even being raised at this time in the courts. The question of motive with the land fraud, the question of witness Dido, who was never called because he was never offered immunity by our office, is not part of the legal pleadings. Mr. Dixon is talking about the land fraud but they are not pursuing that at this time. They may -- they have been filing papers over the years, maybe they're going to file more papers sometime, but that is not part of the issue. And the way that the five, the five quick reasons that the experts are being pursued, there is previous litigation under the PCRA, which may seem like a convoluted technical argument, but what it is, is they have raised this very issue.

1

6

8

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They're just putting the twist of forensic pathologist on it now that they didn't have before. And, I point all of that out, and that's why I would hope the superior court will affirm on that basis alone.

Secondly, as I said, there's no underlying merit that there's a problem here. The other four issues become due process. Under the constitution, a due process argument basically is being made that a fair trial wasn't given because the forensic experts weren't used. But, because all of this evidence basically got in anyways, to Detective Freeman and the chief pathologist, Dr. Joshua Purpura, there's no true due process violation there. There's also no after discovered evidence, which is the third way that they try to get it in because they can't meet the four prongs of after discovered evidence. In fact, they fail on three of those prongs, and there is nothing after discovered about any of this.

I have a case in point from superior court.

I believe it is Weise that basically says, you
cannot have an expert look at evidence that was
presented at a trial and call it after discovery,

because he's going to render an opinion on it now. In that case they actually call it a ridiculous argument, that it can't -- that's not the proper use of an expert witness. They also attack it in a novel twist now on appeal that they did not do in front of Judge O'Brien, they call it a Brady -- (end of side two of tape one.)

(Side three)

MR. GILMORE: -- suppress the evidence from them, didn't give it to them at trial. If a prosecutor does that, it is not a good thing and that is certainly grounds, for, perhaps, a new trial, if not a reversal, and that did not occur here, we do not have a true Brady v.

Maryland problem because the evidence was given to them. What they're saying is that they wanted photographs of the dashboard. Well, there were no photographs taken. They got it every other way. In fact, they got our experts to agree with them that this contradicts one small aspects of Miller's testimony. So, you're never going to have a Brady --

MR. FISHER: That doesn't amount to suppression. It just wasn't available.

22

23

24

25

MR. GILMORE: Right. The prosecution didn't suppress anything, so there can't be a Brady v. Maryland problem. They've considered it as an Arizona vs. Youngblood problem. Now, that's a disturbing claim, and that goes into the induendoes that there's some sort of manipulation by the police force to basically get Goldblum and not worry about who actually did the murder. Arizona vs. Youngblood is, if the police, through the exercise of bad faith, do not gather evidence, or destroy evidence or do not make it available to the defense. There is no indication of that. Everyone was forthright. Full discovery was given. I, in my brief, I could cite you volumes of discussions about the discovery prior to this trial. Attorney Rothman never objected. Attorney Rothman knew about the fact that there were no photographs of the dashboard and he made the best use by his full cross examination of Detective Freeman. The fact that they would like to have photographs, and that there could have been a few other things done, is not a bad faith effort of the police to suppress anything. They put it forth. And they never, in my view,

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

win on a claim under Arizona vs. Youngblood.

And, lastly, my view is also that these experts are going beyond what an expert is allowed to do. They are trying to basically rule on an ultimate determination of fact that they can't do, that only the jury could do. There's a litant of cases. Cease is probably the biggest case in which you can't have child psychologists come in and bolster a child victim in a sexual assault situation, said, child victims cannot -- normally not -- they'll try to explain why a child victim might not testify as to sexual acts committed upon them. There's a litany of cases in various aspects, but you can't have an expert go beyond what their expertise is. The experts should not be

Basically -- they would never be allowed to testify in a court of law about the dying declaration, about other things. That would be weighed by a jury. They're going too far in their affidavits and in their testimony as to what an expert should do, and I have basically set that forth. So that is the extent of the major claims now before superior court.

Like I said, previous litigation alone

25

kicks all of those claims and they have no underlying merit. They can't get the claims The claims have been looked at. forward. There is no fundamental due process problem in They got a fair trial. Mr. Goldblum this case. and Mr. Miller got a fair trial. And one last point that I'll close on is, there has always been accomplice liability here. The fact that the prosecutor was not happy that his witness, his star witness may not have been a very good witness or maybe lying in part, was always known to the jury, was always known to the prosecution. And, in fact, we went after Mr. Miller and got first degree murder in his case also. And, the prosecution's job was done in that it presented it to the finder of fact. And the supreme court has always indicated that we went after both men as accomplice liability. They rejected Miller's claims in their published opinion in his case that you can't go after me now after I helped them get Goldblum. Basically, they rejected that saying, no, the prosecution always proceeded against both men on their accomplice liablilty. I realize that they claim that we are now maybe changing our theory of the case.

I do not believe that's true, and I fully brief that for the courts. I know that is not necessarily the matter before you, but everything seems to be going --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You make a good point, Mr. Gilmore, and I agree, as far as the forensic scientist, and often remarks that seem to go beyond is typically permitted in a court, it says something about, you know, the good and bad of the Board of Pardons forum. The bad is that such things, sometimes reckless, sometimes usable are heard. But that's the nature of this forum.

MR. GILMORE: I understand the proceeding is broad.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That remarks and observations, the kind that you offer as well as Mr. Markovitz, and I say that respectfully, are aired, are heard, and we can consider such things. So, anyway, let me make sure that General Fisher is completed.

GENERAL FISHER: Yes.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Unless there's further questions, I believe that, I know that Mr. Earl Wilhelm would like to address the board. And --

1	and you ought to stand by too because you may
2	well have some things that come up and try to
3	get to the bottom of them, that's why we're here.
4	MR. GILMORE: Thanks.
5	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay, Mr. Wilhelm.
6	Mr. Wilhelm, would you hold one moment, please?
7	I think the warden would like to ask a clarifying
8	question of Mr. Gilmore.
9	WARDEN: Mr. Gilmore, it wouldn't be fair
10	to Mr. Markovitz if I didn't ask you a couple
11	of quick brief difficult questions.
12	MR. GILMORE: Correct.
13	WARDEN: You mentioned Mr. Miller. We're
14	talking about credibility between Goldblum
15	and Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller also pled not
16	guilty, correct, throughout the trial
17	MR. GILMORE: Correct.
18	WARDEN: And his involvement in the
19	stabbing?
20	MR. GILMORE: Correct. He basically said
21	that he sat by while Mr. Goldblum did the
22	killing.
23	WARDEN: To you knowledge, has he ever
24	admitted his involvement in the murder?
25	MR. GILMORE: There is one to my

22

23

24

25

knowledge, no. There is one thing that the defense has pointed to, a "Pittsburgh Post-Gazette" article, maybe it was a "Pittsburgh Press" article, in which in the article a reporter says that he sees Miller in jail and says, what are you in here for? And Miller says, I'm in here for killing a man. And now they maintain that's an admission that he did it alone, or that he did it solely. I believe that is not an admission of anything. I dealt with that in my brief to Judge O'Brien in superior court. That's not an adequate offer of proof. They've never gotten an affidavit from Miller. They've never gotten a recantation by him. If he did recant, that would be suspect, of course, and I wouldn't ask that.

WARDEN: For the record, I need you to know that Mr. Miller did tell me that he did contribute in that stabbing.

MR. GILMORE: I'm sure that he -- I can believe that he did. My view is that they both participated in the stabbing. I think that is fairly evident. I think that the jury thinks that.

WARDEN: I believe that he maintained that position, I'm guessing 15 years or so. It's only been the last few years that he's come out and admitted his part in the murder.

MR. GILMORE: Well, that's -- I think that's good that he has admitted his part in the murder and I believe that he is still inculpating Mr. Goldblum, I'm certain. But it doesn't surprise me that they both did it, and that they both actively participated in aspects of the assault and that Miller's testimony was not a 100 percent accurate. And I don't think it surprised the jury. In fact, KDKA t.v. interviewed two jurors, and I saw it on television where they basically, the two jurors said, we know that they both did it. So they had no qualms.

WARDEN: The former Assistant District
Attorney, Mr. Dixon, twenty some years later has
a complete 180 degree reversal. How do you
explain that?

MR. GILMORE: I believe that he's not fully familiar with all of their claims. Like I said, he is centered on the land fraud motive, forgetting the arson motive to the killing,

forgetting that this is a three part crime. I do not agree with most of what he said. In fact, he sounded a lot like Attorney Rothman's closing argument to the jury. Mr. Rothman pointed out many of these things that he said today. Most of this was fully disclosed.

I do not understand why Mr. Dixon is doing what he's doing, even though he's -- I've heard his explanation now and I saw it once on television, and I believe that he's not fully informed about their claims and that he's not fully informed -- he's not talked to me or anyone from our office who has been handling the case, and I discredit whatever he's saying.

WARDEN: The last item I have for you, and this is probably something that you may not have direct knowledge of but you're kind of on the hot seat representing the district attorney's office out of Allegheny County, where are those files at? What happened to them?

MR. GILMORE: I know that they're not in the district attorney's offices because I, and other people in my office looked high and low for them. I know that we have a copy of the coroner's photographs, which I made available

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

to John Pischinsky (phonetic) and Rhoda Knapp
who came to our office and looked at them. So
there are still a complete set -- I don't know
if it's a complete set, because I don't know what
the coroner's files had in them because I haven't
seen those, but we have a set of those. In fact,
I photocopied them and put them into the record.

There's a pleading that's about 180 pages, which is a letter that has all of the police reports that they now say that they don't have, which I now provided for them. They said that they lost everything. I don't know what the attorneys did with the files over the years, but I had to -- they did have some materials and we provided what we had. We had some crime lab reports, which I was able to provide them. As to why the file records have been lost, it was never my burden to find out where those files are because I believe that it's a matter of law that there is no validity to any of their claims, and even if you accept all that they say is true, almost a demur to what they're saying, it doesn't mean anything because they're not -there isn't a due process violation because the jury had all of that. So I don't know where

i

the files are within the coroner's office.

Dr. Purpura, I mean Dr. Wecht, did see the files in the coroner's office, and he was able to look at them at the time that he gave his opinion. He's saying that they are now missing since he became the coroner. His explanation will have to stand for whatever he says about that. But there were sufficient things. I think that Dr. Lee is correct that you can't really make a beyond medical certainty type of evaluation based on what you see.

ask you something here as we give way to

Mr. Wilhelm's brother. This is always difficult

moments for the survivors. So we ask you,

particularly, Cyril Wecht, talking about his

take on things, his depiction on what happened

in the car and suggesting that Goldblum, because

of the lack of forensic elements could not have

perpetrated this. Care to counter how

mechanically he could?

MR. GILMORE: Well, I know that Mr. Miller testifies that Goldblum wore clothing to cover his regular clothing and he disposed of that, so that's reason why there's no blood on him.

25

And I know that, basically, it seems hard to believe that just one man is going to throw him over the edge and that they didn't both participate in the killing. So Miller may not be a hundred percent accurate, of course, and that's why he's serving life in prison. But, with regard to what forensic evidence was testified to, it is clear that the brunt of the assault occurred outside of the vehicle. That's where the most blood was found. What little bit of blood was found and testified to was simply blood splatters along the dashboard. Now, according to Miller, the first blow that was struck was by Goldblum with a wrench when he hits him in the side of the head.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Would you repeat that?

MR. GILMORE: That there was a wrench that was sitting in the back seat that was used by Goldblum to strike the victim in the head and that's the initial blow that was done before the blade. It was half of basically a trimming blade.

Mr. Wilhelm participated in a lot of political campaigns and kept this in his back seat and he used it for signs. Apparently, he

24

25

had devised his own little tool for using -- for putting up signs. It was not a normal knife. But that the inital blow was from the, according to Miller, there was a blow struck in the car and then Miller says that the blade is not used until they get out of the car, and that's where the forensic experts now are saying that there's a problem with Miller's testimony because if this blood splatters, that indicates a cut in the shooting of blood that gets on to the dashboard. And so for all we know, there could have been blood from the wrench blow alone, although that probably is not indicative because whatever blow to that head that the wrench blow gave was not, it was made not such that it would cause breaking the skin, it was more of an abrasion, or something like that.

So, I mean, you are going by Miller's account of the physical assault. What I would suggest, and what the jury did not buy into was that it really, in his account, in the heated moments of what a two or three minute assault occurred was not entirely accurate. That really is meaningless as to whether or not both men did the killing, and that the forensic experts, the

fact that there is a discrepancy is understandable.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Yes.

MR. GILMORE: It was more so --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I think that each of the board members will tell you that Clarence Miller still says, even until recently, that both physically had a hand in the stabbing.

MR. GILMORE: I would submit that has to be accurate, and that that would be, that both men did physically do it. In fact, that was our theory when we went in front of Miller's jury and we were able to get a conviction there.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay.

MR. GILMORE: And, before Mr. Wilhelm speaks, I would note that the jury itself decided that this was a life imprisonment. The victim's family, out of deference to the applicant's family, chose not to seek the death penalty and ask the prosecutor not to do that. This -- back then, a penalty phase must be held the way that law was, and, of course, that law was thrown out. And if the death verdict had been imposed because that statute was thrown out, it would never have been invoked. But, I

Ι

would say that to preface his comments, they 1 have been through a lot. They have shown great 2 compassion and they have been consistently 3 fighting this with our office, and I know that's why they're here today. Thank you. 5 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: These are always 6 difficult moments. 7 MR. GILMORE: Correct. 8 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: And you can take your 9 place. Mr. Wilhelm. Mr. Wilhelm, can we have 10 your full name for the record? 11 EARL WILHELM: Good morning, Members of the 12 Pardon Board, ladies and gentlemen. 13 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Can we have your full 14 name for the record, sir? 15 EARL WILHELM: My name is Earl Wilhelm. 16 am the brother of George Wilhelm. 17 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You've watched the 18 proceedings here today and may think a 19 deference knowing that this is the first time 20 we're hearing from you directly. Love to hear 21 your remarks. You have a place in this so what 22 would you like to have the board know? 23 EARL WILHELM: Thank you. We are here 24 today, I'm here to represent my family members 25

which are seated behind me. My mother, my daughter, my brother. We are here today, very disturbed of Charles Goldblum trying to seek communications (sic). We don't know exactly what this means. We feel that he is trying to lessen the charges that he was convicted of against him to a different degree.

Charles Goldblum was found guilty of murder.

Okay? Charles Goldblum was found guilty of
murder in first degree. The sentence for murder
in first degree is life without parole. We are
here to add to whatever was said here today, and
I would like to speak on some of the remarks
that were said here today.

I was present throughout that trial. I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a forensic scientist, but I'm a person of character and I'm a person with respect for the law and I trully believe that whatever the jury found in this case represents the highest part of the law when the decision comes down in a man's life. On that day, when he was found guilty.

I heard the testimony presented here today, each and everything that was explained here today, and some of the difficulties that our

defense had because of a new attorney representing us today, it isn't very difficult because the facts of the trial remain. The facts of the trial, the evidence was shown at that trial was based on a decision that come down from the jury, which was unanimous, that he was sentenced for this horrible crime for the punishment that he committed. The sentence for that crime, was life without parole.

What we are hearing here today, we are hearing thoughts and theories of what happened that night. We would like to present a few thoughts of our own. It's theory, but above all, the facts of the case, the facts of the case and our explanation was put into a letter. As difficulty as it is, we will try to explain this today.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Wilhelm, let me ask you --

EARL WILHELM: Yes, sir.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We have about five or ten minutes here.

EARL WILHELM: Okay, sir. Thank you.

Just recently we found out, and in the past, about the letters that were sent into the

22

23

24

25

Board of Pardons. There's three big issues that we'd like to bring our opinion up that we feel is wrong in what they are saying. Okay. The issues are, the big issues that they're trying to say that a dying declaration. don't refute the fact of a dying declaration. Probably the best way explained is when a man is to meet his Maker, he is assumed to tell the truth. We don't deny that fact. We agree with that fact. All we are saying on our end of it, we have our own opinion to that, our opinion is this, through our association of what we knew about Clarence Miller is his affiliation with George, we feel that in his last dying breaths that George Wilhelm named Clarence Miller, not because Clarence Miller was the only one that participated in this horrible crime, because the pieces through, whatever the police discovered at the trial and everything would tie together. He had the spirit of God behind him when God give him this strength with the brutalness of this murder. That is our belief of the dying declaration.

As the trial begins, as the trial begins, prior to the trial, for all of the appeals, we

j

had to go through this horrible ordeal for over a year, through all of the appeals that were made. During that time, while Mr. Charles Goldblum was out on bond, he tries to solicitate to kill Clarence Miller. He bases that on poor judgment. To this day, he bases that on poor judgment on his part. Okay.

After he finds out, the proof of that comes out at the evidence of the trial, the facts by an undercover police officer that he tried to solicit. Upon hearing that, his bond is taken off of him and he is put back in prison, or he's put back in jail. At that time, being highly disturbed, to show his demeanor this man, he decides that he would like to have four detectives killed. He tries to solicit that before the trial even starts.

Throughout the trial, through all of his denials and everything that he wasn't there, after the evidence comes out at the trial and he openly admitted that he was there by the eye witness that was described here today, by one of the eye witnesses, and all of the questioning from the police, we didn't have privy to all of that information. We don't know. Through his

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

demeanor, through his lies, through his words, he lacked poor judgement on everything that he says in this case.

On the night of the murder, after, after he openly admits after all of this is brought against him, facts, on the night of the murder, he says, I hopelessly stood by. I was horrified. I watched Clarence Miller attack George Wilhelm. I didn't know what to do. As this brutal attack took place, as George -- as Miller was stabbing, George went to the wall. I said, to myself, with this horrible crime being committed, I said to myself, or, I beg your pardon, I didn't have anything in my mind to get out of there or nothing like that because Clarence Miller knew about the murder and I was. he was my client and there was a confidentiality there, so what I tried to do, I was scared. as Mr. Miller stood at the wall, Mr. Miller puts up his hands and says, look, I don't have this weapon in my hands.

Common sense will tell you, this is a man, this is a man that outweighed a murder charge for confidentiality that he thought Clarence Miller was going to expose him for the arson.

1.1

Okay. He rushes to the wall. He says, as

George is pushed over the wall, he rushes to

the wall and he says, I stood there, and after

I was sure that George was dead, I took Clarence

Miller and I drove him home.

It is pretty hard to believe some of the other evidence that was said in this case that they say that there was no blood stains found on Charles Goldblum. It is pretty hard for me to believe that the clothes or something that he had, even his shoes. I seen the pictures. I seen the blood trail that this was never questioned about this man, but it doesn't have to be because the man admits his presence.

On that night when George was savagely and brutally attacked, he was butchered. As I speak here today, the decision of that jury's mind is, and the decision will always be in their mind, it took two men to do this.

Some of the testimony as to how George got to that garage that night is based on money.

Probably all of it is based on money why this is happening. This is our family's theory of the money. Regardless of all of the lies that it was said by both conspirators in this case, regard-

less of all of the lies trying to save their own skin that they didn't actually take the active part of actually stabbing George, that's something we may never know. But we do know this, he was either helped, aided or assist. It took two people. In what manner they attacked George, perhaps we'll never, never know. Even if both of them today was to admit would that be a lie or would that be the truth?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Wilhelm, I wanted to make sure that you had the opportunity to provide your comments and thoughts here.

EARL WILHELM: Yes, sir.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The board members may have questions or things that need clarification.

Let me just interject for a moment respectfully, sir, anything that needs to be raised here?

We're at 11 o'clock, so I know you're mindful of finishing up.

EARL WILHELM: Okay, sir.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Are you mindful of finishing up?

EARL WILHELM: Yes, sir. Very mindful.

And I would appreciate it when I'm done that

members of my family may speak. I'm sure it 1 will be brief. 2 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Well, if you have 3 things that you would like to say, the items 4 that you brought with you to the table. EARL WILHELM: Pardon, sir? 8 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Your brought things 7 with you to the table? EARL WILHELM: I didn't hear you. Oh, ÿ yeah, I brought a couple of things. 10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: For what purpose? 11 EARL WILHELM: For the purpose of 12 clarifying our grief and the only image that we 13 know of George today. 14 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me ask you to do 15 that now. 16 EARL WILHELM: Okay. Before I show this 17 I would like to say one thing, please. 18 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay. 19 EARL WILHELM: And this why I'm presenting 20 these. Charles Goldblum is begging for his life. 21He's asking for mercy. He showed no mercy for 22 George when he brutally murdered him. Okay. 23 His family, as his father said here today, from 24 the difficult times that they're going through, 25

23

24

25

as he sits in prison here today, with the difficulty and what they say and the reputation that they try to paint of this man, what constitutes a murder? Okay. They took this man's life. What price to life? twenty-three years they're asking for his leniency. He was convicted of life without parole. Okay. They are able to see, they are able to touch, they are able to feel, they are able to communicate with their loved one, Charles Goldblum. Our family's only communication with George is our visit to his grave site and our communication through prayer. These pictures that I bring here today, that and our feelings are all we have in memorance of George is a picture of George.

This is a small picture too as big as

George played a part in our life. This here is
a picture of George. He was in the United

States Navy. Served during the Korean War.

He was honorably discharged.

One other thing, if I may, real quick.

This here is a list of all of the accused has going for them. This barely scratches the surface.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: All the what? I 1 didn't hear you. All of the what? 2. EARL Wilhelm: All of the rights of the 3 accused. 4 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I see. okay. Go ahead. 5 EARL Wilhelm: Over here, I have none. 6 I would like to add two things to this --7 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You do. You do have 8 rights. 9 EARL Wilhelm: Yes, sir. 10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We respect your 11 position in this and that's why we wanted to 12 hear from you, and that's why we encouraged you 13 not only to present the written remarks that 14 you did, and so well, why we encourage you, 15 Mr. Wilhelm, to be with us today to provide 16 directly your sentiments. We do respect your 17 place in this. 18 Louise Williams in part is a member of this 19 board because of our interest and sensitivity in 20 seeing to it that victim's rights are of the 21 same prominence as the defendant's rights in 22 this forum. So, carry on. 23 EARL Wilhelm: Yes, sir. If I may, I would 24 like to bring out two other rights that we have. 25

In 1997, the voters of this state voted on a position that was long overdue in this state. They represented the rights of the victim's family on that board. It was unanimously, I believe, if I'm correct, one million one hundred and twelve thousand people voted for this, that they would have this right. Okay. As we were represented here by counsel today, we think that this is a monumental thing in this state for a victim of crimes throughout the country.

The second part, we are so proud to have the position of counsel coming from Allegheny County and all of the work through the district attorney's office through the years to this present day. They represented all of the facts in this case, not the thoughts and not the theory. Okay. Hopefully some day for the great decision that was made for the victim's rights family that everybody will truelly have the rights of counsel for the victims of crime.

So, speaking for my beloved family here today and all of my beloved family at home, all of George's friends, acquaintances, and all of the people that dearly loved him, from the

crime vitims's families of this state and all across the country, for my father who is no longer with us, and George, which I feel is looking down at these proceedings today and give me the spirit and courage to come here to speak. With that, I thank you very much, sir. I thank you very much.

We are here today because you must uphold the decision that was passed by this state for the crime of first degree murder, which is life without parole. Thank you.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Wilhelm, let me ask you, before you go. In the interest of giving equal opportunity to you, any concerns from the board members? Thank you, Mr. Wilhelm. And would you kindly take those things with you?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. And take your place.

EARL Wilhelm: I certainly will.

Is there anyone else that would like to speak in opposition of the commutation?

Sir, may I ask you to -- yourself. Are there any others? I had asked earlier, so I'm surprised. Yourself. And, you, ma'am?

MRS. Wilhelm: I'm his mother.

3

5

7

6

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Are you going to be commenting?

MRS. Wilhelm: I'll be commenting.

HARRY Wilhelm: My name is Harry Wilhelm. I'm George Wilhelm's oldest brother. You just heard from Earl, the youngest brother. I'm here to talk basically about the trial for Charles Goldblum. He was given a fair trial. He was found guilty of first degree. He was sentenced to prison with no parole. I repeat, no parole.

As I'm talking to you, and as I was sitting there hearing everybody, I was looking up at one of the commandments, Thou shalt not kill. When my brother was killed in that parking garage lot, Mr. Goldblum didn't think of that commandment that night. He thought George luring him up to that parking garage and killing him. And not even killing him in a humane way, like just shooting him. They stabbed him repeatedly. It's all in the trials. And then when they were done stabbing him, to finish him off altogether, they threw him over the roof figuring, boy, that's it. We'll get this guy.

My father can't be here today. He died a

few years ago but before he died he said, as 1 long as one of us have any breath in us, we're 2 going to fight for justice, and I don't mean 3 partial justice, I want you to consider total 4 justice in this case. I'll just repeat one more thing. He had a 6 fair trial. He was found guilty. He was 7 sentenced to life in prison without parole. I hope all of you ladies and gentlemen Ÿ consider that strongly. 10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We will. 11 HARRY Wilhelm: That's all that I have to 12 13 say. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We will. Board 14 members have any concerns? Any questions? 15 Thank you, sir. 16 HARRY Wilhelm: Thank you. 17 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. 18 Mrs. Wilhelm. 19 MRS. Wilhelm: I suppose that my both sons 20 said all that could be said at the trials. I 21 have been really under doctor's care since this 22 happened. And he was a wonderful son to me and 23 his father and his whole family. He was loved 24

25

by so many people. Had a lot good friends in

his life, but he had to come up with this here, the two men that he put his faith into, that he was gullible enough to believe them. And this was all set up, pre-meditated, to my opinion, and all I have to go to is a grave site to talk to my son, and my husband right next to him, his father.

And I want yunz to see this picture too.

He served in the U.S. Navy during the Korean

War. Also to the people out there, the

Goldblums, you have your son to visit, I don't

have my son to visit, only to a grave to talk

to him and to my husband who passed away.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mrs. Wilhelm, may I ask you politely to address the board?

MRS. Wilhelm: Okay. This is a sad situation, And I've suffered through many years of this here. My husband, his father, he retired in 1975 hoping that he would have some sort of a nice retirement. Four months later, on February 10th, he retired, I'm sorry, this murder happened. So you can know in your own hearts what kind of a retirement that my husband had to go through until he died.

All of these appeals that we went through.

Board for Clarence Miller when he got his last appeal, him and I came up, my husband and I. 3 So all I'm -- my sons, both sons, they were at 4 the trial. I was unfit to be at the Goldblum 5 trial but I was at Miller's trial through 6 medications and everything to give me the 7 courage to go to the second trial at least, but I just hope and pray to all of the people here 9 that justice will be served, and I can't go on 10 much longer in my life. I'm going to be 84 next 11 week and it's pretty hard for me too. 12 So I want to thank all of yunz for being 13 here today and doing -- listening to our side of 1.4 the story, because it's -- I had to come today 15 because I got to defend my son, he's not here to 16 defend himself. So, I want to thank yous all 17 18 very much. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: You did fine. 19 Thank you. 20 MRS. Wilhelm: It's pretty hard to stand 21 up here. I'm shaking all over, but --2.2 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I can see that. 23 MRS. Wilhelm: Okav. 24LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mrs. Wilhelm, thanks 25

1

We was, him and I was up here to the Fardon

for your effort.

 $$\operatorname{MRS}$.$ Wilhelm: Thanks to all of yens. Thank you.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Ma'am.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Sandra Martin. I'm George's goddaughter, his godchild. He was like a second father to me and his death affected me like nothing ever will in my life.

We're here today, we're begging you to please uphold sentencing that was determined back at the time of the trials.

I'm sorry. The jury --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Just tell us how you feel.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. The jury saw everything. They heard everything. They heard the testimony. They heard the forensic testimony, but they heard more than just the forensic testimony, they also heard -- I'm sorry, the evidence. They also heard the testimony of Mr. Goldblum himself. This man did nothing but contradict himself, lie, there were so many inconsistencies in his testimony.

What the jury saw, what was presented at both trials was much more than what was presented

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here today. He just -- I'm just very upset to see that the present counsel is trying, they're trying to paint a picture of Mr. Goldblum as an honest, family oriented person. We really beg to differ on that.

I guess I'm just -- I'm trying to stress the point that this man was a professional. He was a lawyer. He chose to become implicated in certain events. He set up, he was involved with the arson. He -- I just recently read documents that he, himself, admits that he only admitted to the arson some years after the trial, and I guess that I've always been concerned that why would a lawyer, a person who is educated, a person who has great insight into laws and workings of the justice system, why would he have been involved in something like this? Gone through -- been implicated in a murder, then present at the time of a murder, everything.

He claims that the reason that he did not

-- that he was involved in all of these items

was because he was so terrified to let his

family know that he committed this arson. That

he just -- I'm having a really hard time saying

this. I'm sorry. He chose to be involved in this chain of events, fully knowing. He knew what repercussions these actions would have, yet he consistently involved himself in the chain of events --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: What's your -finish up here. We have some things to clarify
here, I'm sure. What's your broader point here
that you just mentioned in the last two minutes?

MS. MARTIN: My broader point is that, from what I recently read, he claims that the reason that he became involved in a lot of the things that went on was because he was in fear of -- I'm just -- he was in fear of Miller perhaps maybe ratting on him, for lack of a better term. Informing his parents of what actually happened with the arson, he chose to go along with Miller on items, on things, and it was all based on the fear that his parents would eventually find out of the arson, and it doesn't make sense.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That has been portrayed. Let me ask you. What is it that you would like the board to know?

MS. MARTIN: We'd like, I would like for

you to know that we believe that he did have a 1 fair trial. We believe that the evidence that 2 is being brought up now is not true evidence. 3 It is nothing but speculation. There is no, 4 there is nothing concrete that they've brought 5 up --6 7 (End of side 3 tape.) MS. MARTIN: -- perhaps may have come up 8 with the same opinion that the jury did because they're looking at a piece of the equipment now, 10 they're not looking at the whole picture as it 11 was twenty some years ago. 12 We're begging you just to uphold the law. 13 We know that you've done your best and that the 14 defense has done its best in presenting the case 15 and it must be upheld. 16 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: And you've made your 17 point. 18 MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much. 19 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Anything else? 20 MS. MARTIN: No. 21 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you. And be 22 assured, and I say this to the members of the 23 Wilhelm family, survivors, the record will 24 reflect not only the remarks that you provided 25

today, it will also reflect that you provided photographs of the deceased. Obviously, you felt compelled to bring those, and it means something to you, and what I've come to understand, it means an awful lot to survivors, the victims, that you have the opportunity to do just that. We respect that. So, thank you. I'm sure it takes a good deal of gumption and committment to come here today. So, thank you. And I know I speak for the board when I say that.

Now, let me ask Mr. Markovitz, you've been both respectful, and we appreciate your ernest and your advocacy, and that ought to be recognized. And we thank you for that.

Anything that you'd like to raise or try to clarify today at this moment? because we're going to wrap up.

MR. MARKOVITZ: I understand that, and almost everything that my worthy adversary has said, I disagree with. Some of them were simply factually incorrect. I don't even know where to begin except to tell you just a few things off the top of my head. The testimony of Bill Hill. Bill Hill testified that he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

believed that he heard Mr. Wilhelm mention
Mr. goldblum's name. He never said that it was
in connection with any kind of a land deal,
and he was unsure of when Mr. Wilhelm mentioned
Mr. Goldblum's name.

And, in my opinion, because the trial took place about a year and a half after the murder, and because Mr. Hill was a friend of Mr. Wilhelm's and was a public figure himself, and a controversial one, his testimony offers really nothing of substance to the case. But, with regard to all of the previous litigation, there has been substantial litigation through the courts. It is difficult to undo a murder conviction. It is very, very difficult to do. I would just point out to the board that this is the first litigation, and when I say this, I mean the present PCRA in which we have any of the expert testimony, and this is also the first time that we have the prosecutor, who we normally would think of as being the most knowledgeable person say that he got it wrong. So there is new things going on.

The jury heard about a blood splatter.

They heard nothing about the meaning of the

1.6

blood splatter. Certainly we can't -- the prosecutor didn't know the significance of it, the defense lawyer didn't know the significance of it because nobody was asked. No experts were consulted with. Obviously the jurors, 12 lay people, would not have known the significance of it.

There is no evidence that this was a two man assault. In fact, just the opposite is so. There is only one murder weapon. The victim had cuts and stab wounds all over his body, front of the torso, back of the torso, front of the face, back of the head. He was obviously not being held or restrained. It's a one man attack, and it is obviously an unplanned attack. There is no murder brought to the scene.

The murder weapon is in the victim's car.

Mr. Goldblum, Mr. Miller had no idea that they

would end up in the victim's car that night.

The murder is committed on the exposed top deck

of a parking garage. I went up there about a

couple of months ago, it's still there. I

looked around. Windows from higher buildings

all of the way around. There must have been at

least 150 windows with an unobstructed view of

the scene of the murder. So, it is an unplanned murder. It appears to be a one person murder, and, you know, there are many other things that Mr. Gilmore said that I disagree with, but we could go on and debate this case forever. It's a complicated case, and I would just ask you to have the courage, and search your hearts about this case.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you, sir, we appreciate that. You can take your places. And, before we go, Mr. Gilmore, I want to clarify something. Hold one second. It relates to the supporters of commutation.

Mr. Dixon --

MR. DIXON: Yes, sir.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I'm curious, extra curious. You're the prosecutor.

MR. DIXON: Yes, sir.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: It has something to do with credibility of -- as it relates to Mr. Goldblum. You prosecuted him and then today you defend him. I'm curious as to what drove you, what happened to bring about this change of heart in you?

MR. DIXON: Well, I read the transcript --

INTEUTENANT GOVERNOR: As it relates to ï credibility. 2 MR. DIXON: Yes. З LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: What? MR. DIXON: When I read the transcript I 5 saw really for the first time, the defendant was denied a fair trial because he was not allowed 7 to call his one and only key witness for the defense, and that was Thadius Dido. And what 9 was presented to the court was this --10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Why did you oppose it? 11 MR. DIXON: I didn't oppose it. That's my 12 point. That's why I wanted to explain it further. 13 We were in chambers with the court. Dave 14 Rothman says, we have to have Ted Dido. He's 15 the only one who can support our testimony and 16 say Clarence Miller is lying about the land 17 fraud. And that's the whole basis for the 18 Commonwealth's murder conviction. So what he 19 said, he gave the --20 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay. So you're not 21 addressing Goldblum's credibility? 22 MR. DIXON: I am. But number one --23 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me --24 MR. DIXON: -- I'm saying he didn't get a 25

fair trial. 1 LITEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me frame this. 2 Let me frame this. I'm sure you're -- you had, 3 you have a reputation of accomplishment, and certainly effective in the courtroom. What I'm trying to get at is -- so the credibility 6 of Goldblum newly created in you is the result 7 of you believing that the trial wasn't handled 8 properly? MR. DIXON: No. No. No. 10 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Or something --11 MR DIXON: No. No. I don't believe in 12 the credibility of either Goldblum or Miller. 13 I don't look to the credibility -- they both 14 lied. admittedly, and I told that to the jury. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I see --16 MR. DIXON: I'm not here because of their 17 credibility. I'm here for a different reason. 18 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: That's my question. 19 It was a question begging for clarity. One 20 moment you prosecute and one moment you defend. 21 So, you're not really defending him --22 MR. DIXON: I'm not defending him. 23 Absolutely not. The man's a criminal. 24LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: -- established 25

1	credibility on his part?
2	MR. DIXON: No.
3	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Let me ask you. As
4	the prosecutor, how did you depict Goldblum's
5	participation in the murder from the back of
6	the car then?
7	MR. DIXON: What we argued to the jury was
8	at the time, believing that he was involved in
9	the land fraud, I argued that it was
10	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: No. I'm asking you
11	about in the car at the top in the parking lot.
12	MR. DIXON: I understand.
13	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: As the prosecutor,
14	how
15	MR. DIXON: I had to go
16	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: how did you depict
17	that mechanically?
18	MR. DIXON: I had to go with what my
19	witness said, and that was
20	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I see.
21	MR. DIXON: that Goldblum struck the
22	victim from behind with the wrench. That Miller
23	then attacked him from the front with the blade.
24	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I see.
25	MR. DIXON: And then, in fact, all of this

was consistent with the physical evidence because the blood, the attack really, except for the first blow or so, took place outside of the car. There was a trail of blood all of the way across to the wall where the assailant continued. All of the blood in this case was found on Clarence Miller. The gloves, the gloves which has the blood of the victim on it had the hair of Clarence Miller inside. There was no hair of Charles Goldblum. The bloody clothes of Clarence Miller that he admittedly says that he had on, he cast away and threw into a bin. There was testimony that these kinds of wounds would cause blood squirts, so the blood squirts were on him.

The reason that I'm here today, really, is because I saw that he didn't have a fair trial. When he addressed the court with two options. He said, and Virgin Islands vs. Smith says that a man should be able to call, and I submitted that with my letter, Virgins Island vs. Smith is the key case here, and the Pennsylvania cases under it, and there's this one line that I would like to quote you from that case. Third Circuit, it says, the essential task of

a criminal trial is to search for the truth, and this search is not furthered by rules which turn the trial into a mere poker game to be won by the most skilled practition. And here it sets up two basis for when the court can immunize a witness. We're familiar with the Commonwealth.

Now, this is what the defendant said. The Court says, Your Honor, I ask you to immunize Ted Dido so that he can testify for me. He's not going to testify unless he gets immunity. What Smith says is, and I quote, when it is found that a potential defense witness, which was Dido, can offer testimony which is clearly exculpatory, which it was, and essential to the defense case, and when the government has no strong interest in withholding the immunity, and I had none, because I subpoenead him too, and, remember, Dido was not a codefendant in the murder case. He was not a target to the murder case.

Some of the Pennsylvania cases decided after Smith --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Okay.

MR. DIXON: -- denied the immunity because

he was a codefendant in the case of --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon, I'm going to ask you to take a minute and wrap up because we're almost two hours over the time.

MR. DIXON: Certainly. The only point that I would add is this. If the defendant is given a new trial, all of his legal side activities of the post conviction, everything, it gives him nothing because all it can give him is a new trial. And as I said before, his key witness is dead, and he wasn't dead at the time, and the court should have given him that witness and that's why the jury verdict came in as it did.

My opinion is that the jury verdict would have been different if Dido had testified because when you balance Clarence Miller against Goldblum, it tilts the balance to Goldblum.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Mr. Dixon, did Dido ever testify anywhere?

MR. DIXON: There never was any transcript, that's the other crime. There's no transcript of sworn testimony. There's no statement from him at all anywhere ever.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: So you don't know what he's going to testify -- you don't know --

MR. DIXON: Yes, we do know because it is 1 on the record that Mr. Dido and his counsel 2 advised defense counsel that if immunized, or if 3 it was taken under seal, which was another 4 option given to the court, that he would testify 5 in support of what Goldblum had said about not 6 being involved in the land fraud. That's on the 7 record. 8 MR. FISHER: But he never testified? 9 MR. DIXON: He did not testify. 10 MR. FISHER: You had mentioned earlier that 11 your job as a prosecutor was to get justice. 12 Why didn't you call Dido as a witness? 13 MR. DIXON: I did. I subpoenaed him. 14 MR. FISHER: Why didn't you call him? 15 MR. DIXON: I did. He wouldn't testify 16 because he wanted immunity. 17 MR. FISHER: Why didn't you give him 18 immunity? 19 MR. DIXON: I didn't want to give him 20 immunity because I didn't know what his testimony 21 was going to be, but I was willing to have the 22 testimony taken under seal. Now why wasn't it 23 taken under seal? That wouldn't have been any 24 prejudice to the Commonwealth. The defendant 25

could have had his witness. He would have had a fair trial, we wouldn't be here on this issue.

That's what I discovered.

GENERAL FISHER: All right. I appreciate your position and your candor. I find your position on the Dido testimony a little bit incredulous, however. Put that on the record.

MR. DIXON: Well, under Smith --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: We're going to conclude this. I think the General is entitled to finish up there.

MR. DIXON: Thank you.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: Thank you, Mr. Dixon. So to finish up, knowing that we are almost two hours past what is typically alloted, and I hope that the members of the audience and those associated with this matter understand the respect that we have for each of both parties and the fact that we thought disgression would obligate us to provide such time because we wanted to hear both and weigh both. We hope that is appreciated.

Are you finished? Care to finish up?

Anything that you would like to say?

MR. GILMORE: The fact that I may disagree

25

with Mr. Markovitz is obvious, and we have fought this hard through the courts. I believe there is no legal claims.

As to Mr. Dixon's statements, that is not even before the court, and that is his own invention at this point, and I don't believe that I even need to do rebuttal on that.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:

Thank you. Let me note that it is now, I have just about 11:35, and before we depart to executive session and return and provide the decision, I just wish to, and I believe that I speak for the board and acknowledge that the conduct of both attorneys, as far as your command and your advocacy and your respect, we appreciate that.

And let it be said, and I can't predict the decision, let it be said that you were wonderful advocates for both positions. So, with that, this board stands in executive session.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: I'll call again to order the May 6, 1999 Public Meeting of the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons in the matter of Goldblum and direct the Secretary to begin the roll call, and before he does that, after we complete the roll call then the board will

1	retire to the executive session room for a few
2	moments and momentarily return to the Supreme
3	Court Chambers to address the balance of the
4	docket and the 12 cases that we have, and I'm
5	assuming, Mr. Secretary, that you've assured
6	the first presenter, Sandra Ander, that will be
ï	undergoing shortly?
8	MR. SECRETARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
9	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: The secretary will
10	begin the roll call.
11	MR. SECRETARY: In the matter of Charles
12	Goldblum, Ms. Williams?
13	MS. WILLIAMS: No.
14	MR. SECRETARY: Warden Gilotti:
15	WARDEN GILOTTI: No.
16	MR. SECRETARY: General Fisher:
17	GENERAL FISHER: No.
18	MR. SECRETARY: Governor Schweiker:
19	GOVERNOR SCHWEIKER: No.
20	MR. SECRETARY: The application is denied.
21	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: With that, we'll move
22	to executive session for a few moments.
23	