Supreme Court weighs reliability of eyewitness testimony
For the first time in three decades, justices consider the reliability of visual identification

By Robert Iafolla

WASHINGTON - Herman Atkins had never heard of Lake Elsinore before he was accused of assaulting and raping a woman in that California resort town.

The victim fingered Atkins as her attacker after seeing his face on a poster hanging in a police station marking him a wanted man for an unrelated shooting incident. Due in part to the victim's identification, a jury convicted the 21-year-old Atkins. He served more than a quarter of his 47-year sentence in Folsom Prison before that identification was proved wrong. DNA evidence exonerated Atkins and he was released in 2000.

Atkins is one of several exonerated defendants whose stories are told in an amicus brief warning the U.S. Supreme Court that suggestive circumstances can generate identifications that, while sincere, are inaccurate and may lead to wrongful convictions.

"If it's not limited to suggestive circumstances created by the police, why is unreliable eyewitness identification any different from unreliable anything else?" - Justice Antonin Scalia

The court took up the subject of eyewitness testimony for the first time in three decades during oral argument Wednesday. The justices considered whether identifications merit special due process safeguards whenever they arise out of circumstances that lead a witness to believe a suspect is the perpetrator.

Justices on the right- and left-wings of the court aggressively questioned why eyewitness testimony should be treated differently than other types of evidence. They also worried special protections to screen out misidentifications would undermine the role of the jury and usher in a major change to how criminals are prosecuted.

The issue stems from a case brought against Barion Perry for allegedly breaking into a parked car. A woman claiming to have seen the thief from her apartment window identified Perry, who happened to be standing near a group of police in the parking lot at the time. Police responding to the break-in call had found Perry holding radio amplifiers, which he said he had found on the ground. He also claimed to have seen the perpetrators leave the lot before the police arrived. Perry v. New Hampshire, 10-8974.

The witness was later unable to identify Perry in an array of photographs, but she testified at the trial that resulted in his conviction. He appealed, arguing the trial court shouldn't have denied his motion to suppress the identification. New Hampshire's high court upheld the conviction, ruling that due process protections for eyewitness testimony only kick in when police orchestrate suggestive circumstances.

"Many things have happened since the Supreme Court last looked at [eyewitness testimony]," said Elizabeth F. Loftus, a UC Irvine psychologist who has challenged the reliability of eyewitness testimony and is not involved in the case before the Supreme Court. "Tons of scientific research has elucidated conditions under which eyewitness testimony is more or less reliable. The greatest development - and it's tragic in a way - is that DNA exonerations show eyewitness misidentification is a major cause of wrongful convictions."

Mistaken identifications were involved in 190 out of 250 convictions overturned by DNA evidence in a study by University of Virginia School of Law professor Brandon L. Garrett.

Perry's advocate at the Supreme Court, New Hampshire public defender Richard Guerriero, argued eyewitness identification made under suggestive circumstances - as in the case with Perry, where his proximity to police in the parking lot may have created the wrong impression on the witness who fingered him - creates a unique danger for mistakes, regardless of whether the police intentionally arranged the suggestion. Such situations should be "red-flagged" so the trial judge can evaluate the identification's reliability because sincere eyewitness testimony can be very convincing to juries, even if the witnesses are actually mistaken, he said.

But the court seemed resistant to Guerriero's argument.

"If it's not limited to suggestive circumstances created by the police, why is unreliable eyewitness identification any different from unreliable anything else?" Justice Antonin Scalia asked.

Justices Stephen G. Breyer and Ruth Bader Ginsburg pointed to existing safeguards against prejudicial evidence. Attorneys can cross-examine witnesses and judges can exclude testimony or instruct juries to consider problems with its reliability, they said.

Justice Anthony M. Kennedy worried about "usurping the province of the jury," while Justice Samuel A. Alito Jr. said barring testimony because of suggestive circumstances would be a "drastic change" to criminal trials.

Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. disagreed with Guerriero's notion of suggestiveness, defined as conduct that says to a witness: "that's the man."

"But whenever the witness is asked [about a suspect], at least there is a suggestion that 'this might be the man,'" Roberts said. "And I don't know why you would think that's any greater than 'this is the man.'"

New Hampshire Attorney General Michael A. Delaney argued that prior Supreme Court decisions on eyewitness testimony focused on due process problems created by police manipulation. The existing safeguards are chiefly meant to deter police from "stacking the deck" against a defendant, not to keep out unreliable testimony, he said.

Justices Sonia Sotomayor was the only justice to forcefully push back against Delaney's deterrence argument, saying it means judges must deduce police officers' states of mind to determine if they meant to manipulate witnesses.
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