Detail of March 1, 2006 Confession	Did the State claim that this detail was corroborated by physical evidence?	Did the State's physical evidence actually corroborate this detail?	Source of Contamination: Police Prompting	Source of Contamination: Widespread News Reports	Source of Contamination: Brendan's Pre-Existing (Innocent) Knowledge of Crime Scene	Did Defense Counsel Raise Contamination at Trial?
Teresa Halbach was in Steven Avery's trailer on October 31, 2005.	Yes	No	The state of the s	×		No
Teresa was restrained with handcuffs.	Yes	No		×		No
Teresa was shot in Steven's	Yes	Yes	×	×		No
Teresa was shot ten or eleven times.	Yes	Yes		×		No
Teresa was shot with Steven's .22-caliber rifle.	Yes	Yes		×	×	Partially (1)
Teresa was shot in the left side of the head.	Yes	Yes	×			Partially (2)
Teresa's body was placed in the rear cargo area of her Toyota RAV4.	Yes	Yes	×	×		No
Teresa's body was burned in Steven's fire pit.	Yes	Yes	×	×		Partially (3)
A car seat and tire were used as fuel for the fire.	Yes	Yes			×	No*
Teresa's RAV4 was driven to the "pit area" of the salvage yard, an area demarcated by a stand of trees.	Yes	Yes		×		No
Teresa's RAV4 was concealed with branches and a car hood.	Yes	Yes		×		No
The license plates were removed from Teresa's RAV4.	Ύes	Yes	×	×		No
Steven Avery went under the hood of Teresa's RAV4.	Yes	Yes	×			Partially (4)
Steven's garage floor had been cleaned with bleach.	Yes	Yes			×	No*
The key to Teresa's RAV4 was hidden in Steven's bedroom.	Yes	Yes		×		No
Teresa's clothing was burned in the fire.	Yes	Yes	×	×		No
Steven Avery had a cut on his finger.	Yes	Yes		X		Partially (5)

Steven's fiance, Jodi Stachowski, called him twice on October 31, 2005, including once at 5:30 PM.	Teresa's cellular telephone, camera, and purse were burned in a burn barrel.	Detail of March 1, 2006 Confession Did the State claim that this detail was corroborated by physical evidence?
Yes	Yes	Did the State claim that this detail was corroborated by physical evidence?
Yes	Yes	Did the State's physical Source of evidence actually Contamination: corroborate this detail? Police Prompting
	×	Source of Contamination: Police Prompting
	×	Source of Contamination: Widespread News Reports
×		Source of Source of Contamination: Contamination: Brendan's Pre-Existing Widespread News (Innocent) Knowledge of Reports Crime Scene
N <sub>o</sub> *	No	Did Defense Counsel Raise Contamination at Trial?

- However, counsel never made this argument during closing arguments and never established that this information was widely disseminated in the media. (1) Trial counsel asked Mark Wiegert, "[Brendan] could have had preexisting knowledge about that gun hanging up there in the bedroom, couldn't he?" (R. 4/21/07. 57.)
- head, was you?" (2) Trial counsel asked Wiegert, "Isn't it true, Detective, that the first person, during the course of this exchange with Brendan on the 1st, who even mentioned her being shot in the (R. 4/21/07. 28.) Counsel never made this point during closing argument, nor did he ever allude to the lengths that the detectives had to go through

to get Brendan to adopt their claim that Teresa was shot. Further, no mention was made of the fact that the officers were first to mention that Teresa was shot in the side of the head

- was widely publicized in the media. (3) Trial counsel asked Wiegert, "Isn't it true that prior to that phrase, 'a human body,' being uttered by Agent Fassbender, that Brendan Dassey never said anything about seeing a human body [in the fire]?" (R. 4/20/07. 78.) This point was not made in closing arguments and no mention was made of the fact that this piece of information
- Wiegert was never cross-examined about this fact. (4) During closing argument, trial counsel stated: "What did he do under the hood? [The interrogators were] the first ones that brought this up." (R. 4/25/07. 127.)
- Neither this argument nor the fact that the media publicized Avery's cut finger was mentioned during closing arguments. (5) Trial counsel asked Wiegert, "If [Brendan] was over there tending the fire and he saw Steve had a cut finger, does that surprise you?" (R 4/21/07. 61.)

independent of Brendan's testimony Brendan testified about his own innocent pre-existing knowledge of these facts at trial, but his attorneys never raised his pre-existing knowledge as a contamination argument