

Ms. Hughes:

Thank you for reaching out to me for comment on the recent filings in the above case. While this matter is in litigation, I cannot comment fully on the case, but our office will be filing a complete response to the motions and I will see that you receive a copy of that response.

The allegations contained in the filings are untrue. There was no inappropriate conduct of any kind by me or my office. There was no threat, coercion, extortion, or duress offered against me, anyone in my office or in law enforcement in this case by Dana Cheatham. Nor has any person ever done that in any case I have ever prosecuted. I have never heard the alleged recording in this matter and knew nothing of its contents until I read the pleading on a social media page. That page had access to the filing and had published it prior to my office receiving the pleading.

When the Cleveland Police Department advised me that there was a recording which alleged misconduct on my part, I told them not to share any information about the recording with me. I advised them that they should conduct an independent inquiry to the extent they believed appropriate. If they found even a remote basis to investigate further, I told them I would ask the Tennessee District Attorneys General Conference to appoint a District Attorney Pro Tem and request that the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation assist them. There was never a request for either.

If you commit a homicide in the Tenth Judicial District, our office will prosecute you. In this case, that is exactly what happened. Justice was administered fairly and with the utmost care to all parties concerned. Contrary to the assertions in the response, I did not present the case to the Bradley County Grand Jury. One of my Assistant District Attorneys, Drew Robinson, did. Daniel Gibbs was the Cleveland City Police Department Detective that offered the evidence and General Robinson advised the Grand Jury as to the law. Four potential options were presented to the Grand Jury that day. They were asked to choose between First Degree Murder, Second Degree Murder, Voluntary Manslaughter and Self Defense. Given all the proof, the Grand Jury returned an indictment for Second Degree Murder.

The case was litigated by two Assistant District Attorneys in the office. I did not participate in the trying of the case, although when asked for my opinion on an issue, I gave my best advice as I do in every case that comes into this office. The jury who heard this case, found the defendant guilty of Second Degree Murder.

An independent agency investigated the homicide. An independent agency reviewed the allegations of the recording. An independent Grand Jury heard the proof, chose the criminal offense and returned a true bill to the indictment. An independent jury heard all the relevant

proof and convicted the defendant of the same charge the Grand jury indicted on, Second Degree Murder. An independent judge denied the Defendant's motion for a Judgment of Acquittal after hearing the proof.

There was no misconduct in this case by this office. It was prosecuted justly and ethically. A jury of the defendant's peers heard the relevant evidence and spoke with clarity and force and they said "guilty."

Stephen D. Crump
District Attorney General
Tenth Judicial District

