



**CONNECTICUT INNOCENCE PROJECT**  
State of Connecticut  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES

c/o McCarter & English  
CityPlace 1, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, CT 06103  
e-mail: Karen.A.Goodrow@jud.ct.gov  
(860) 275-6140 Telephone  
(860) 275-6141 Fax

KAREN A. GOODROW, ESQ.  
DIRECTOR

**TESTIMONY OF  
KAREN A. GOODROW, DIRECTOR,  
CONNECTICUT INNOCENCE PROJECT**

**Raised Bill No. 6344**  
*An Act Concerning Eyewitness Identification*

**Judiciary Committee Public Hearing**  
**March 9, 2011**

My name is Karen Goodrow and I am the Director of the Connecticut Innocence Project, which is a part of the Division of Public Defender Services. **We support Raised Bill No. 6344, An Act Concerning Eyewitness Identification** which would mandate the use of “double-blind, sequential” live and photographic lineups as well as other reforms to insure the reliability of identification procedures, in connection with the investigation of crimes. “Double-blind” refers to a lineup administrator who is not aware of who the actual suspect is, and to a witness who is informed that the perpetrator may or may not be in the array. Sequential refers to the presentation of subjects to the witness one at a time for a determination, rather than presenting all subjects simultaneously as part of a group.

**As has been demonstrated by the exoneration of James Calvin Tillman, misidentification by eyewitnesses accounts for a large majority of the wrongful convictions occurring in our justice system. The new bill requires only “when practicable” that law enforcement utilize best practices to avoid misidentifications and wrongful convictions of the innocent.**

Significant research in the field of eyewitness identification, particularly by Professor Gary Wells of the University of Iowa, indicates that the risks of mistaken eyewitness identification are reduced when these techniques are used. Without the “double-blind” procedures, it has been shown that awareness of the actual suspect by the administrator can result in inadvertent verbal and non-verbal cues that influence the witness to select the actual suspect. Simultaneous presentation of the subjects frequently results in identification of the subject who most closely resembles the perpetrator, regardless of whether or not it is the right person.

Although the Chief State's Attorney has implemented an eyewitness identification protocol that is an improvement over past practices, the protocol is neither double-blind nor sequential, and is limited in its effect. Furthermore, the protocol is not an adequate substitute for these procedures and is still susceptible to the risks that double-blind, sequential procedures are designed to minimize. As such, the Office of Chief Public Defender urges that these procedures be statutorily required.

In June, 2006, DNA technology freed James Calvin Tillman from eighteen and a half years of imprisonment for crimes which he did not commit. His wrongful conviction was the result largely of misidentification. In January, 2008, through the same DNA technology, the real perpetrator was identified and arrested.

To date, there have been 266 post-conviction DNA exonerations nationwide. ([www.InnocenceProject.org](http://www.InnocenceProject.org)) It is poignantly clear that misidentification accounts for the vast majority of wrongful convictions. Eyewitness research has linked two basic factors with misidentifications: unintentional suggestion to the witness and "relative judgment process", which refers to the tendency when viewing a simultaneous photo array for the witness to pick out the photo of the person who looks most like the real perpetrator relative to the other people in the array. States continue to pass legislation which will reduce the likelihood of misidentification through the use of "best practices" in identification procedures. These best practices include two basic components: sequential photo arrays and double-blind administration. It is time for Connecticut to do the same.

**Sequential Photo Arrays:** photos are presented to the witness one at a time, rather than simultaneously. Research demonstrates that sequential photo arrays discourage relative judgment and encourage absolute judgments of each person presented, because eyewitnesses are unable to see the subjects all at once and are unable to know when they have seen the last subject.

**"Double Blind" Procedure:** the person administering the photo array does not know who the suspect is, and is not in a position to unintentionally influence the witness's selection. Research demonstrates that persons conducting experiments of any kind in which they know the desired or correct outcome, often unwittingly cue the subject of the experiment or misinterpret the results based on their knowledge or desired outcome. If the administrator of a photo array does not know the identity of the suspect, he/she cannot provide any cues to eyewitnesses. It is important to understand that this recommendation does not presume any deliberate impropriety by law enforcement.

We support and urge the following additional best practices, as set forth in Raised Bill No. 6344:

1. **Communication to the witness:** no communication either verbal or non-verbal should be made to the witness by the administrator or by anyone else, which communication may influence the identification procedure.

2. **Non-suspect fillers:** photos of individuals in the array who are not the suspect are called "fillers"; these photos should be chosen to minimize suggestiveness that might point toward the suspect. In other words, the photos of non-suspects should generally be chosen to resemble the witness's description of the perpetrator. When multiple arrays are shown to a single witness, the fillers should be different from the ones previously used.

3. **Advisement to the witness:** consistent with the Chief State's Attorney's voluntary changes to eyewitness protocols, and the mandate of the Connecticut Supreme Court in 2005 in the case of State v. Ledbetter [275 Conn.534, 579 (2005)], each witness should be instructed that the real perpetrator may or may not be present in the array and that the administrator does not know which person is the suspect. Research shows that telling the witness that the perpetrator may or may not be present reduces mistaken identification rates. Telling witnesses that the administrator does not know who the suspect is will also help prevent witnesses from mistakenly looking to the administrator for cues.

4. **Eyewitness confidence:** an eyewitness's statement of confidence should be assessed immediately after the identification, and prior to any information given to the witness about the identification to protect against artificially inflated confidence levels.

5. **Multiple identification procedures:** avoid multiple identification procedures in which the same witness views the same suspect more than once. Research demonstrates that multiple procedures create the potential for suggestiveness and the potential to contaminate the witness's memory.

6. **Written record of the identification procedures:** to insure reliability and accuracy, written records should be maintained of all identification and non-identification procedures, including the date and time of the procedure, order of photographs, individuals present, photographs utilized, identification information, and source of photographs.