correct?

A That's right.

Q And do you recall on one occasion speaking with Det. Presley over the telephone about a head hair or possible head hair recovered from 's panties and also an axillary or body hair recovered from a transport sheet from the morque?

A Yes, sir. During the initial stages of the investigation there was a very, very short, less than a quarter-inch, straight hair piece, and a hair with secondary sexual characteristics that came in with the body.

Q All right. And on that occasion that you discussed these with Det. Presley, did you give him a rundown, if you will, of what observations you could make? Recognizing, of course, we don't make matches or associations based on fragments that short, but did you give him a rundown of what you had observed regarding possible racial characteristics?

A My opinion to Det. Presley was that these hairs were, indeed, human in origin and that they had origin from a person who was a heavily pigmented Caucasian or possibly a Mongoloid. That includes Hispanics and persons of Asian descent.

Q All right. Did you ever tell him that this was

you testified about State's Exhibit 94 here on the left.

Just for the jury's review, is this the particular exhibit you prepared regarding some hair from Michael Blair, known hair, as well as the head hair you found on the panties, the fragment?

- A This is State's 94?
- Q Yes, sir.

Q All right. Now, in talking about those racial characteristics -- I guess we can put the big one on the tripod for a moment. Move it up just a little bit. All right. Can you point out for the jury once again a little bit about the factors that led you to see what you related as being some Caucasian-type pigmentation in the head hair fragment from the panties?

A An identifying characteristic of

Mongoloid-type hairs is what we call clump and dense pigmentation, along with the clear, discernible cuticle. You can't see it from where you're sitting, but there's a very clear margin between the cortex of the hair and the cuticle itself. This is clump, dense pigmentation with kind of auburn cast that is characteristic of a Mongoloid hair. Caucasians very, very infrequently have this degree of clump pigmentation. I've seen one Caucasian with heavily clumped pigmentation before. All right.

Q All right. Now, that you've distinguished, if you would, or you have distinguished then the pigmentation and the cuticle aspect of Michael Blair's hair in comparison to the fragment that you recovered from the panties, is the same true for the fragment that you recovered from the body transport sheet?

A My first discussion was about the hair from the body transport sheet.

Q Okay.

A With regard to the hair fragment from the panties, you also see a rather dense clump pigmentation with a clearly discernible cuticle that is a little bit thicker than you would see in a Caucasian. In this instance this is a photograph of a hair from the panties. The pigmentation, as you go along the shaft of

this hair microscopically, turns into what we term a more Caucasian-type pigmentation, a finer grain pigmentation, and this is an area of Michael Blair's head hair that also has these mixed characteristics. There's a thick, very discernible cuticle, and the pigmentation in this instance also goes to a fine grain type pigmentation. The only clumping you see in this part of Mr. Blair's hair is toward the cuticle.

Q And then with regard to State's Exhibit 93, then, if you could, show the jury a little bit just about the more classic Caucasian-appearance of the hairs portrayed there.

A State's 93 consists of six photomicrographs of the comparison of Caucasian pubic hair. On the left of State's 94, this is a microscope picture of the known victim's pubic hair. On the right side is a photomicrograph of the hair recovered from the panties of the victim. They're both classically Caucasian, fine grained pigmentation. The one on the right has a continuous medulla. The one on the left has a fragmentary medulla. Again, the same representation in the photograph below. The second photograph below on the left is just a higher magnification and the photograph at the bottom is just a representation of the medullary structures.

On the right side of State's 94 is a comparison of the hair found in the victim's panties compared to the suspect. You can see that the suspect more closely resembles the found hair than does the victim. We make -- when we see this kind of difference in the hair from the panties compared to the victim, then we know this is what we term a foreign hair or hair that has not had origin from the victim. So when a suspect is developed, the hairs are retained and comparison is done. You can see that there is very good microscopic agreement between medullary structure, fine grain pigmentation.

The photograph at the bottom is just an example of a root end microscopically. Again, both of these are Caucasian hairs from two different individuals. They show a very fine grain pigmentation as opposed to the clumped pigmentation that we see in the hair from the body transport sheet and the hair fragment from spanties.

Q All right. Thank you.

Based, then, on what you have just discussed with the jury, is it still, then, your opinion that the head hair fragment from 's panties, as well as the body hair from the transport sheet, possess, in your opinion, primarily Mongoloid characteristics?

A There are predominant Mongoloid characteristics

to that location some five days later, after the body has been removed. Let's assume for a moment that that person never leaves the roadway, never gets closer than, what's variously been described, eight to eleven feet to where the body actually lay. And let's say that person had got into a vehicle belonging to Michael Blair, suspect, would you believe in your opinion and your experiences that there would be any likelihood of a transfer of a head hair or any type of hair from the location where the body used to be into the suspect's vehicle? Especially if we also throw in the fact that the person standing on the roadside made at least two, and maybe three, stops and walked around a while before getting into the suspect's vehicle?

A Given that scenario, the tracking of a hair or hair fragment into the vehicle is not a valid concern.

A valid concern would be sitting in the seat and attaching material and getting up and taking material out of the car.

Q All right. Back when this was all breaking on September 10, 1993, was there, at least at one point, some questions asked of you or maybe some other folks there at the police station about Mr. Rhode's having briefly entered Mr. Blair's vehicle?

A Yes, sir.

of the jury.)

MR. MCDERMITT: Your Honor, my assumption,
I'm assuming the only reason he's asking this question
is to determine whether or not we turned it over to our
expert and to imply that our experts -- since they're -our expert didn't come to testify -- found the same or
similar conclusions. All right? One, that's not
rebuttal. Two, it is -- it's an improper question as
regards it's -- it's a comment on the Defense' ability
to present its case in that it forces or shifts the
burden of proof to us. We'd object to any testimony as
to these items being turned over to us for examination
by our expert and the fact that our expert didn't come
and testify. There's no relevance to it, Your Honor.

MR. CLAYTON: That'd be nice if that's the question I was going to ask. That's not the question I'm going to ask.

MR. MCDERMITT: That's my assumption as to why he's doing it. If I'm wrong, I apologize.

(Proceedings in the hearing of the jury.)

Q (By Mr. Clayton) Mr. Linch, you were present, or I should say, we were both present when the hair and fiber that you looked at with regard to this case was turned over to the Defense Counsel, Mr. McDermitt and

BY MR. MCDERMITT:

Q Mr. Linch, you previously testified that comparing hairs or samples based on these photographs that you've just done to the jury would be irresponsible; is that correct?

A My entire testimony was that hair examiners compare head hairs to head hairs and pubic hairs to pubic hairs. So I did not report a comparison of what I ultimately determined to be armpit or axillary hair to Mr. Blair's pubic hair and I did not report a comparison of the hair fragment from the panties to Mr. Blair's head hair. I'm not convinced that the hair fragment from the panties is even a head hair fragment. It is very possibly a limb-type hair, arm or leg.

Q You wouldn't make a determination based on looking at those photos as regards that the hair came from the same individual, would you?

A It would be my opinion that Mr. Blair cannot be excluded as being the source of those hairs.

Q Is my statement, though, correct that you wouldn't render an opinion based on those photographs, other than what you just said?

A Well, my opinion is that most any person of predominant Mongoloid racial characteristics could not

Well, using Mr. Clayton's example, getting into the crime scene where the body was dumped, getting back in the car, then subsequently getting into the

With regard to Mr. Clayton's scenario, you not only -- within that frame of time he described, you have that contact surface coming in contact with many more surfaces, but if you have something like the buttocks of pants going in contact with something, it getting up off that something, and then releasing, then that's more likely for something to fall out on to the pavement than it is to remain on that pants. Is that your question?

- Mr. Linch, did you ever get any known head hair samples from Josh Crowley?
 - No, sir. I did not.
- So if they were taken at a police station or anything, you never received those or those were never forwarded to you and marked or set out as being known samples of Josh Crowley?
 - Or Josh Foster or someone else?
 - No, sir. Α

25

1	Thank you, Mr. Linch.
2	THE WITNESS: May I be excused?
3	THE COURT: You are excused.
4	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Clayton, who is your next
6	witness? It's about break time, but do you have a brief
7	witness or where do we stand?
8	MR. CLAYTON: Let me think about that a
9	moment. Your Honor, the State would call Bill Ziesler.
10	Pretty short.
11	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ziesler,
12	you've previously been sworn. You remain under oath.
13	All right.
14	WILLIAM RAYMOND ZIESLER,
15	called as a witness on behalf of the State of Texas,
16	having been previously duly sworn to testify the truth,
17	the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified on
18	his oath as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. CLAYTON:
21	Q Would you please state your name for the jury?
22	A William Raymond Ziesler.
23	Q Mr. Ziesler, are you the same William Ziesler
24	that testified earlier in this trial?
25	A Yes, sir.
	2191