

Filed in Clerk's Office
TIME 1:20 pm
SEP 29 2022
Rebecca G. Crowe
Clerk of Courts
Bryan County, Georgia

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

IN RE: PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS
AND DISCOVERY REQUESTS
IN CRIMINAL CASES

STANDING ORDER

WHEREAS, this Court is vested with the authority to maintain practices and standing orders to promulgate internal processes of the Court in matters which are not susceptible to uniformity, which relate only to internal procedure and which do not affect the rights of any party substantially, or materially. U.S.C.R. 1.2; Best Jewelry Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Reed Elsevier, Inc., 334 Ga. App. 826, 780 S.E.2d 689 (2015).

WHEREAS, it appears that Defendants frequently file the following motions in connection with all misdemeanor criminal cases pursuant to their obligations concerning such representation:

1. Notice of Defendant's Intention to Proceed under O.C.G.A. § 17-16-20, *et seq.*
2. Defendant's Request for Information Described in O.C.G.A. § 17-16-21
3. Motion for Discovery of Statements of the Defendant
4. Demand for the Inspection, Scientific Analysis and Testing of Evidence
5. Discovery Motion and Motion to Require the Prosecution to Disclose Evidence Favorable to the Defendant under *Brady v. Maryland*
6. Motion for Disclosure of Similar or Extrinsic Act Evidence and for Pretrial Hearing to Determine admissibility of Any Acts Alleged by the State to be Similar Transactions
7. Motion to Require the State to Reveal any Agreement Entered into Between the State and Any Prosecution Witness that Could Conceivably Influence Testimony.

WHEREAS, it appears that O.C.G.A. § 17-16-20, *et seq.* imposes certain obligations upon the prosecuting attorney and counselor for the Defendant in a criminal case where the Defendant intends to proceed under that statute.

NOW THEREFORE, in order to assist the court and the Parties in the expeditious handling of criminal matters, reduce costs and unnecessary paperwork, the Court enters this STANDING ORDER for criminal cases as follows:


In all cases in which counsel for the Defendant files an Entry of Appearance, he or she may file a single pleading invoking the motions listed herein and attached as Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 in all criminal cases (including DUI and traffic offenses). That pleading may incorporate the Motions in the Exhibits in each case file. The pleading shall be called the MOTION TO INVOKE THE STANDING ORDER IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Upon the filing of the pleading invoking this Order, the Clerk shall note on the docket that the “Standing Motions” have been filed.

This Order does not include any motions required by law to state grounds with particularity; provided, however, the Defendant may file a preliminary motion to suppress, which he or she may amend, to fully apprise the State’s counsel of the grounds asserted for suppression as well as the matters allegedly subject to suppression not less than TWENTY (20) days prior to the hearing of any such motion or trial of the case or FIVE (5) calendar days after the date of service of discovery by the State, whichever date occurs last. Furthermore, a list of all witnesses and expert witnesses shall be exchanged between the State and Defendant no later than TWENTY (20) days prior to any hearing or trial and each party shall file any motions challenging any witness no later than TEN (10) days prior to trial. Failure to timely file any motion challenging a witness shall deem such motion waived.

In the event of an appeal from the disposition of any criminal case in which the Defendant has invoked the Standing Motions, the Clerk shall supplement the case file with a copy of the Standing Motions upon preparation of the Record.

SO ORDERED this the 29th day of September, 2022.



Billy E. Tomlinson
Judge, Bryan County State Court
Atlantic Judicial Circuit

EXHIBIT 1

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
V.)
)
DEFENDANT)
)

CASE NO.

**NOTICE OF DEFENDANT'S INTENTION TO
PROCEED UNDER O.C.G.A § 17-16-20. ET
SEQ.**

COMES NOW the Defendant in the above styled matter and files this his written notice of his election to proceed under the provisions of O.C.G.A. § 17-16- 20, *et seq.*, in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

EXHIBIT 2

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
V.)
)
DEFENDANT)
)

CASE NO.

DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
DESCRIBED IN O.C.G.A § 17-16-21

COMES NOW the Defendant in the above styled case and requests in writing that the State furnish to counsel for the Defendant all information required to be disclosed under O.C.G.A. § 17-16-21. This request encompasses the State's witness list, including witness' full name, date of birth, Social Security number, telephone number, and witness' address or location. The Defendant makes this request pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 17-16-21 and also under the provisions of Article 1, Paragraph 14 of the Georgia Constitution. The Defendant further requests that the Court order that this information be furnished to counsel for the Defendant no later than TWENTY (20) days before trial, or as the Court directs.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

2.

Under O.C.G.A § 17-16-22, a criminal defendant is entitled to: (a) copies of any statement made by him while in police custody; and (b) that portion of any oral statement or partial oral statement which is relevant and material.

3.

Additionally, a criminal defendant is entitled to any other statement made by him while in custody, including statements made to inmates or other non-law enforcement personnel. Bell v. State, 179 Ga. App. 491, 347 S.E.2d 321 (1986).

4.

The prosecutor's duty to disclose extends to all statements within the "possession, custody, or control" of either his office or any law enforcement agency or other state agency. O.C.G.A § 17-16-4(a)(1). The prosecutor also has a duty to investigate whether the Defendant made any statements and, if so, to reveal those statements to the defense. See, Gilbert v. State, 193 Ga. App. 283, 38 S.E.2d 18 (1989).

5.

The State is barred from using at any trial any custodial statement that has not been provided upon a timely request. See, McKenny v. State, 204 Ga. App. 411, 419 S.E.2d 82 (1992) (conviction reversed where prosecution used a statement of defendant not furnished in compliance with written demand); Byars v. State, 198 Ga. App. 793, 403 S.E.2d 82 (1991) (same); Davis v. State, 198 Ga. App. 375, 401 S.E.2d 581 (1991).

6.

This motion is made under the authority of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963); Naupe v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S.Ct. 1173, 3 L.Ed.2d 1217 (1959);

Davis v. Alaska, 415 U.S. 308, 94 S.Ct. 1105, 39 L.Ed.2d 347 (1974); United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 96 S.Ct. 2392, 49 L.Ed.2d 342 (1976); Giles v. Maryland, 386 U.S. 66, 87 S.Ct. 793, 17 L.Ed.2d 737 (1967); and United States v. Noe, 821 F.2d 604 (11th Cir. 1987), as well as the constitution and statutory authority cited above.

WHEREFORE, DEFENDANT requests that this Court:

1.

Order the State to provide to the defense written versions of any and all oral statements by DEFENDANT; copies of any accounts, reports, notes or summaries containing statements by DEFENDANT or references to statements by DEFENDANT; any and all written statements by DEFENDANT; audio copies of any and all audio-recorded statements by DEFENDANT; and copies of any and all video recorded statements by DEFENDANT;

2.

Order that such statements be provided within TEN (10) days;

3.

Order that any statement not produced pursuant to this Order be barred from use for any purpose by the State at trial;

4.

Schedule this motion for a hearing, if necessary; and

5.

Grant such other relief as is just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

(3) The disclosure of any fingerprint, DNA, or fiber sample analysis and, if such analysis was performed;

(a) the results of all tests (including fingerprint and ballistics), experiments or comparisons performed on any and all materials, objects, or property seized from the Defendant, or from other persons places or objects searched and/or seized during the course of the investigation. Also, the complete report made by any scientist or expert who either performed or was responsible for performing these tests, comparisons or experiments, including such information as the [1] description of the object tested, [2] exemplars or standards which the item was compared to, [3] tests performed, [4] procedures followed for each test, [5] work sheets, [6] chain of custody for each item, and [7] a summary of the basis for the expert opinion rendered in the report. O.C.G.A. §24-9-64; the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraph XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia; Eason v. State, 260 Ga. 445, 396 S.E.2d 492 (1990) (a basic principle of scientific testing is that careful records of test procedures and results be scrupulously maintained); Box v. State, 187 Ga. App. 260, 370 S.E.2d 28 (1988) (case reversed where state failed to provide exact numerical quantity of drug tested); Durden v. State, 187 Ga. App. 154, 369 S.E.2d 764 (1988) (any evidence of a scientific test offered by the state in its case-in- chief or in rebuttal is subject to discovery).

(b) Any documentation regarding the attempt to perform any scientific test (fingerprint, ballistics, etc.), or procedure (identification, etc.) that may not have been completed or where the attempt to perform the test or procedure failed for

some technical or other reason. O.C.G.A. § 24-9-64; the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraph XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia; Eason v. State, 260 Ga. 445, 396 S.E.2d 492 (1990) (right to subpoena all the work product of a chemist); Foster v. California, 394 U.S. 440, 442 (1969) (case reversed where prosecution failed to disclose that witness failed to identify defendant the first time he confronted him and defendant was identified only after a second and third lineup).

(4) The disclosure of any polygraph examination(s), and if such disclosure is affirmative, the results of such tests performed on any witness or potential witness which may be beneficial and useful to the Defendant to establish reasonable doubt for the purposes of impeachment. Defendant also requests the name, address and phone number of the polygraph operator or operators. O.C.G.A. §§ 17-16-4(a)(3) [former§ 17-7-211] and 24-9-64; the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraph XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia; and Taylor v. State, 172 Ga. App. 408, 323 S.E.2d 212 (1984) (reversible error where written report of polygraph examination not timely provided to defense after O.C.G.A. § 17-7-211 request).

(5) The disclosure of any results or reports of physical or mental evaluations as set forth in O.C.G.A § 17-16-23(a).

(6) A summary of the basis for any expert opinion rendered in a report which the State intends to introduce in evidence in its case-in-chief or rebuttal.

(7) The Defendant reserves the right to:

(a) seek further discovery regarding the nature, extent and procedures utilized in any laboratory testing and the qualifications of any entity or individual performing such tests; and

(b) challenge the procedure or technique utilized in any scientific procedure pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 24-7-702 et al.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

EXHIBIT 5

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
V.)
)
DEFENDANT)
)

CASE NO.

**DISCOVERY MOTION AND MOTION TO REQUIRE THE
PROSECUTION TO DISCLOSE EVIDENCE FAVORABLE TO
THE DEFENDANT UNDER BRADY V. MARYLAND**

COMES NOW the defendant in the above styled matter and moves the Court for an Order to require the prosecutor to make a pretrial production of the information hereafter specified.

This information is sought pursuant to the Due Process Clause of the Georgia Constitution (Article I, Section I, Paragraph I of the Constitution of the State of Georgia) and the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, made applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, as well as Article I, Section I, Paragraph XII of the Constitution of the State of Georgia (guaranteeing indigent defendants the appointment of counsel and opportunity to prepare a defense). See, Coates v. Lawrence, 46 F.Supp 414 (S.D. Ga), affd, 131 F.2d 110 (5th Cir. 1942)*, cert. denied, 318 U.S. 759, 63 S.Ct. 532, 87 L.Ed.2d 1132 (1943).

-
- Bonner v. City of Prichard, Alabama, 661 F.2d 1206, 1207 (11th Cir. 1981), the court held "that the decisions of the ... Fifth Circuit... as that court existed on September 30, 1981, handed down by that court prior to the close of business on that date, shall be binding as precedent in the Eleventh Circuit."

Further, if this material is not produced, the Defendant's counsel will not be able to effectively represent the Defendant in this case, and thus the Defendant will be denied the right to counsel and the right to confront witnesses, both of which are guaranteed under the provisions of Article I, Section I, Paragraph XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia and the provisions of the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, made applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Additional authority for specific requests is noted where appropriate.

I. Prefatory Statement

This motion addresses numerous items that may or may not be applicable to this case because Georgia provides no comprehensive discovery in criminal cases. Since there is no discovery, counsel will not know whether certain requested items even exist without a preliminary response to this motion. Therefore, the Defendant may file additional motions depending upon the State's response to the various requests for disclosure of preliminary information.

Specifically, the Defendant requests:

II. Discovery Requests

(1) The addresses and telephone numbers for all persons interviewed during the investigation whose statements could be deemed exculpatory to the Defendant - whether or not they are to be called as a witness for the State. Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963) (right to discovery of exculpatory material); Hicks v. State, 232 Ga. 393, 207 S.E.2d 30 (1974) (recognizing the applicability of Brady to state prosecutions).

(2) Copies of any statements made by any witness in this case. Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (right to discovery of exculpatory material); Napue v.

Illinois, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S.Ct. 1173, 3 L.Ed.2d 1217; and Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150, 92 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed.2d 104 (1972) (convictions reversed where witness testified falsely and defense not provided with prior inconsistent statement); Giles v. Maryland, 386 U.S. 66, 87 S.Ct. 793, 17 L.Ed.2d 737 (case remanded to determine if witness committed perjury in a rape case); Rini v. State, 235 Ga. 60, 218 S.E.2d 811 (1975) (trial court erred in overruling defendant's motion for production at trial of the statements of witnesses).

(3) The disclosure of any line-up, photographic array or other identification or identification related procedure that involved any witness or prospective witness, and, if such disclosure is in the affirmative, all documents, sketches, pictures or photographic arrays that have been made by, or shown to, any witness or prospective witness in this or any companion case. Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, XII, XIV and XVI of the Constitution of the State of Georgia; Manson v. Brathwaite, 432 U.S. 98, 114 (1977) (once the defendant establishes some sort of suggestivity in the identification process, court weighs the "corrupting effect of the suggestive identification" against the likelihood that the witness nonetheless made a reliable identification) (even where suggestivity is weak, court should still inquire into reliability - the linchpin in determining the admissibility of identification testimony). See also, Neil v. Biggers, 409 U.S. 188 (1972) (each case must be considered on its own facts).

(4) Any report or reports prepared by any law enforcement officer(s) in accordance with O.C.G.A. § 17-4-20.1(c) (Family Violence Act). The Defendant is entitled to these reports pursuant to O.C.G.A. §§ 17-4-20.1(d) and 19-31-1.

(5) The description of all item(s) of physical evidence that the prosecution anticipates using in the trial of the Defendant. Disclosure of the existence of such items is necessary so that counsel can determine whether a motion for pretrial access is necessary to

guarantee the Defendant's right to a fair trial. Parks v. State, 254 Ga. 403, 330 S.E.2d 686 (1985) (disclosure of a witness' statement occurred at trial. ["The appropriate standard to be applied...is whether the disclosure came so late as to prevent the defendant from receiving a fair trial." [Cit.] United States v. Sweeney, 688 F.2d 1131, 1141 (7th Cir. 1982)]).

(6) The make, serial number, sales and ownership history of any firearm that the prosecution may attempt to link to the Defendant or otherwise relate to this case. Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, XII, and XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

(7) The disclosure of any photographic evidence and, if the State intends to seek the admission of any such evidence, that counsel be allowed an opportunity to review the same in advance of trial to determine whether a pretrial hearing is necessary or decide whether they are unnecessarily prejudicial or inflammatory. Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraph I of the Constitution of the State of Georgia; Ramey v. State, 250 Ga. 455, 298 S.E.2d 503 (1983) (n.1, the use of photographs should be limited to only those which are relevant and illustrative of the issues); Brown v. State, 250 Ga. 862, 302 S.E.2d 347 (1983) (standard for admitting autopsy photographs); Osborne v. Wainwright, 720 F.2d 1237 (11th Cir. 1983) (claim of fundamental unfairness is a federal constitutional issue and not a state evidentiary issue).

(8) Disclosure of the identity of any informant utilized by the State in this case. Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963); Thornton v. State, 238 Ga. 160, 231 S.E.2d 729 (1977) (trial court erred in failing to conduct a hearing to determine informant's status); Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53, 77 S.Ct. 623, 1 L.Ed.2d 639 (1957) (state's interest in protecting informant must be weighed against the right of the defendant to a full

and fair opportunity to defend himself); Sowers v. State, 194 Ga. App. 205, 390 S.E.2d 110 (1990) (trial court erred in failing to conduct a hearing where the informant was the only person in a position to refute officer's version of occurrence).

(9) Disclose whether any physical, documentary, photographic, scientific, electronic or other potential evidence has been destroyed. Jordan v. State, 247 Ga. 328,276 S.E.2d 224 (1981) ["Only if evidence is carefully preserved during the early stages of investigation will disclosure be possible later," citing United States v. Bryant, 439 F.2d 642 (D.C. Cir. 1971)]; Arizona v. Youngblood, 488 U.S. 51, 109 S.Ct. 333, 102 L.Ed.2d 281 (1988) (failure to preserve evidence – bad faith test).

(10) Disclose whether any agent of the prosecution, informer, or anyone else at the direction of the prosecution has talked with or communicated with the Defendant since the return of this indictment or while the Defendant was in custody. If so, identify each individual and the circumstances surrounding the contact. Maine v. Moulton, 474 U.S. 159, 106 S.Ct. 477, 88 L.Ed.2d 481 (1985) (informer placed in indicted subject's jail cell to elicit information - incriminating statements made to informer after right to counsel had attached should have been ruled inadmissible at trial).

(11) Disclose whether any evidence which the State will seek to introduce at trial was created, evaluated, generated or enhanced by the use of computers and, if so, disclose if the State will make available to the Defendant the software or computer program(s) utilized to create, evaluate, generate or enhance such evidence. Fifth and Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, XII, and XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

(12) The full names and addresses of all persons who have given information to the prosecuting attorney or law enforcement officers relating to the arrest of the Defendant and the charges against him/her. Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; and Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, II, VI, XII and XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

(13) The names and addresses of all unindicted co-conspirators. Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; and Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, II, VI, XII and XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

(14) There may be other items and matters of evidence, information and data in existence that are not enumerated aforesaid and of which Defendant is unaware. Defendant now requests and demands that he/she be afforded with any and all evidence and information, whether specifically delineated and listed herein or not, that is known or may become known or which, through due diligence, may be learned from the investigating officers or the witnesses or persons having knowledge of this case, which is exculpatory in nature or favorable to the accused, or which may lead to exculpatory or favorable material, or which might serve to mitigate punishment. This includes any evidence impeaching or contradicting the testimony of prosecution witnesses, or instructions to prosecution witnesses not to speak with or disclose the facts of the case with defense counsel. See Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed. 2d 215 (1968); United States v. Giglio, 405 U.S. 150, 92 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed. 2d 104 (1972); Holbrook v. State, 162 Ga. App. 400, 401, 291 S.E.2d 729 (1982) (exculpatory witness statements are subject to disclosure under Brady); Sellers v. Estelle, 651 F.2d 1074, 1077, n.6 (5th Cir. 1981) (withholding of such reports constitute reversible error).

III. Request for *In Camera* Inspection

Defendant requests that the Court make an *in camera* inspection of the prosecution's entire file to determine whether or not the Defendant is entitled to listen to, inspect, copy or read, prior to trial, all or any portion of the State's file. Williams v. Dutton, 400 F.2d 797 (5th Cir. 1968 (trial court ordered to make *in camera* inspection of file subsequent to denial of Brady motion); Tribble v. State, 248 Ga. 274, 280 S.E.2d 352 (1981) (trial court required to conduct an *in camera* inspection of the state's file if the defense makes a request after the state responds to a Brady motion).

IV. Relief Requested

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests:

(a) That a hearing be held on this motion in order that the proper foundation may be laid as to what evidence, information and data is in the possession of the State and prosecution, and that the State be directed to make such disclosures immediately;

(b) That the Court make an *in camera* inspection of the State's file and, with regard to those items not voluntarily disclosed by the prosecution, that all items not disclosed be properly identified and examined *in camera* by the Court, and that the Court turn over to defense counsel all such material which the Court finds to be favorable to the Defendant as to innocence or sentencing;

(c) That, unless the parties can agree to a mutually convenient time and place for the examination of any physical evidence, the Court order the State to make available for inspection and examination to counsel for the Defendant, all physical evidence that is subject to disclosure pursuant to this motion;

(d) That counsel for the Defendant, in addition to being allowed to examine any documents subject to disclosure, be provided with copies of the same or, in the event that the State will not agree to the same;

(e) That the Court allow the Defendant ten (10) days from the date of the hearing on this motion within which to file additional pretrial motions addressing those issues which cannot be resolved by consent; and

(f) That the duty of the State to disclose pursuant to this motion, or any order of this Court, be continuing up and until and through the trial.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

EXHIBIT 6

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
V.)
)
DEFENDANT)
)

CASE NO.

**MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF SIMILAR OR
EXTRINSIC ACT EVIDENCE AND FOR PRETRIAL HEARING
TO DETERMINE ADMISSIBILITY OF ANY ACTS ALLEGED
BY THE STATE TO BE SIMILAR TRANSACTIONS WITH AUTHORITY**

COMES NOW the Defendant in the above styled matter and moves the Court for an Order compelling the State to produce any similar or extrinsic act, general bad act or prior conviction evidence that the State anticipates attempting to introduce against the Defendant as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity and/or absence of mistake or accident, as provided for in O.C.G.A. § 24-4-404(b). Specifically, the Defendant seeks information pertaining to the identity of individuals and the dates and transactions alleged to be extrinsic act evidence or evidence of general bad acts or prior convictions of the Defendant.

The Defendant submits that the disclosure of the evidence described by this motion is required by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution as well as Article I, Section I, Paragraph I of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

Prompt pretrial production of this type of evidence is in accordance with Uniform State Court Rule 31.1 and will enable the Defendant to prepare appropriate legal objections to the admissibility of such evidence, such as an objection establishing insufficient similarity or connection between the independent crime or misconduct and the offense for which the

Defendant is presently on trial. The Defendant respectfully submits that there is no valid justification for non-disclosure at this juncture.

Defendant further moves for a pretrial hearing to determine the admissibility of any alleged similar transaction(s) that the State will seek to introduce at trial against the Defendant.

Counsel submits that a pretrial hearing would be in the interest of judicial economy in that the jury would not be inconvenienced by any extended presentation of evidence or argument. In addition, if the hearing is held pretrial, counsel will be able to provide the Court with briefs on any issue of law that may develop.

Finally, the Pretrial determination of admissibility would assist both the State and the Defendant in the organization and presentation of their respective cases. The Georgia Court of Appeals in the case of Poole v. State, 201 Ga. App. 554, 411 S.E.2d 562 (1991), noted, in dicta, that it "is preferable that [a hearing] be held before trial." In the Poole case, the State's attorney made a reference in his opening statement to a prior drug distribution offense that, as of that time, had not been ruled admissible by the Court. Although there was no error because it was later determined that the act was admissible as a similar transaction, the possibility for mistrial clearly existed. Counsel suggests that a pretrial hearing would alleviate this type of predicament.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant requests that his motion for a pretrial hearing on this matter be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant

EXHIBIT 7

IN THE STATE COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
V.)
)
DEFENDANT)
)

CASE NO.

**MOTION TO REQUIRE THE STATE TO REVEAL ANY AGREEMENT
ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE STATE AND ANY PROSECUTION WITNESS
THAT COULD CONCEIVABLY INFLUENCE HIS OR HER TESTIMONY**

COMES NOW, the Defendant in the above styled matter and moves the Court for an Order requiring the State to reveal any agreement entered into between the Solicitor-General's office or any other law enforcement agency and any prosecution witness that could conceivably influence the witness' testimony. The credibility of prosecution witnesses will be an important issue in this case. The evidence of any understanding or agreement as to future prosecution or any other consideration is relevant to that issue.

Defendant specifically requests that the prosecution disclose whether or not any witness, co-defendant or co-conspirator, in return for any consideration from the State in any form whatsoever, has agreed to testify, provide evidence or information leading to evidence, or in any other manner agreed to assist the State in the prosecution of this action. This would encompass any and all considerations or promises of consideration given to or made on behalf of co-conspirators, whether indicted or unindicted, and any other government witness. By 'consideration,' the Defendant refers to absolutely anything of value or use, including but not limited to immunity, grants, witness fees, release on bail, release on bail without security, special witness fees, transportation assistance, assistance to members of witness' families or associates

of witnesses, assistance or favorable treatment with respect to any criminal, tax, civil, forfeiture, or administrative disputes or potential dispute with the State or the United States (including any possible probationary, parole or deferred prosecution situation), placement in a "witness protection program," and anything else which could arguably create an interest or bias the witness in favor of the State or against the defense or act as an inducement to testify or to color testimony. See, Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150, 92 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed.2d 104 (1972) (evidence of expected leniency by a prosecution witness who is or could be charged or convicted of a crime is relevant to the question of his credibility); Jolley v. State, 254 Ga. 624, 331 S.E.2d 516 (1985) (state under a duty to reveal any agreement, even an informal one, with a witness concerning criminal charges pending against him); Allen v. State, 128 Ga. App. 361, 196 S.E.2d 660 (1972) (good faith of the prosecutor, in that he did not know offer of leniency conveyed to witness is immaterial).

The refusal of the prosecution to reveal any said agreement constitutes a violation of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section I, Paragraphs I, II, XII and XIV of the Constitution of the State of Georgia.

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Defendant