



194 of 252 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 FDCHeMedia, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
FDCH Political Transcripts

October 14, 1999, Thursday

TYPE: PRESS CONFERENCE

LENGTH: 6645 words

HEADLINE: ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE

SPEAKER:

ALEX HUNTER, BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO DISTRICT ATTORNEY

BODY:

BOULDER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS
CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE

OCTOBER 14, 1999

SPEAKERS: ALEX HUNTER, BOULDER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

BOB GRANT, ADAMS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

BILL RITTER, DENVER DISTRICT ATTORNEY

MICHAEL KANE, SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

*

(JOINED IN PROGRESS)

HUNTER: Good afternoon. I'm pleased to be here with my district attorney colleagues and the prosecutors that have been working the JonBenet investigation, plus Detective Sergeant Wickman, who from the very beginning has worked with us day in, day out with his team of detectives from the Boulder Police Department that have served this community, and I think those across our land who care about this case doggedly. They have been outstanding men and a woman who have assisted the grand jury during its term.

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

Two of the district attorneys, as Suzanne Laurian (ph) just mentioned to you, are not with us, their schedules did not permit it. I want to pick up with you just for a moment -- because I want the time to be saved for you and I do want my two district attorney colleagues to be able to give you a couple of introductory comments and thoughts and insights. I want to pick up on a statement that I made yesterday that I'd like to underscore, and that is that we have eight career prosecutors with many, many years of service, who together have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to bring charges at this time.

Now, yesterday as I walked away from talking with you and with the American public, there was one question that was fired at me from where we spoke back to the justice center, and that was "Alex, what were your emotions? Does this -- is this a failure?" And I said I'd speak to that just for a minute today. I have an aching heart about where we are with this case, but by no means do I or any of the men that you see at this table feel a sense of failure, and maybe because that is because we are American prosecutors who follow the evidence, not a theory. And we will continue to follow the evidence in this case as long as there is work to be done.

We find no reason to give up heart. We find no reason to quit, and we plan -- and we're going to talk a little bit about that with you this afternoon -- to continue with diligence, the effort that we believe has been underway since the beginning of this case. I'd like now to have my colleague to my right give you a few of his thoughts before we take your questions.

GRANT: I'm Bob Grant, most of you know me. I'm the district attorney in the neighboring county of Adams. I've been involved in this case since February of 1997, been in the prosecution business for 22 years, elected district attorney next door since 1992. This is not a happy day. Yesterday was not a happy day. There is no satisfaction here in Boulder, there is no satisfaction in this case.

But I think of all of the questions that I've had lately, some of the important ones revolve around why can't we talk? Why can't we tell the people of the 20th judicial district, the people of the state of Colorado, the people of the world who are watching, what's happening, what has happened and what exactly the condition of the investigation is? And you need to understand some things about that. The grand jury process is an ancient process. It's a time-tested process.

In an investigative grand jury setting, which is what has happened here over the last 13 months -- not a rubber stamped grand jury, not a "just bring them in, give them charging evidence, turn them loose" grand jury, not a way to duck a prosecutorial responsibility grand jury, but truly an investigative grand jury setting -- there are two tools that the grand jury brings. One, the grand jury can subpoena people and evidence before it. The police, the district attorney cannot. Two, the grand jury can guarantee, guarantee under penalty of law, confidentiality for people who will come forward either through subpoena or otherwise, and give evidence. That guarantee is the heart of why we can't discuss with you what's happened over the last 13 months. That guarantee is bigger than this single homicide case. If we were to say to you this is what the grand jury did, this is what the grand jury heard, this is what the evidence in this case is, that guarantee is shot for all.

The grand juries that in the future call people before them cannot say with any degree of credibility or trustworthiness, "come talk to me, and your evidence will be secret until or unless somebody is charged." We can't violate that oath, and it's not just because of the court's order, and not just because the risk of contempt, but it's because of the Anglo-Saxon history and importance of the grand jury process. I think that's important for people to understand. There is nothing that we would like better than to be able to tell you everything that we know. The practical reality, and the legal realities we cannot. Let's talk about evidence for a minute.

Everybody, everybody is speculating about what the evidence is and is not in this case. We, again, cannot discuss evidence, because this case is not over. Now, a lot of people call that into question. A lot of people say "the grand jury is done, nothing else will happen. This case is finished. It will go on a shelf. Twenty years from now, we'll be saying the same thing." Well, those of us who have dedicated our lives to law enforcement and to prosecution cannot and do not believe that. The fact of the matter is Sergeant Wickman and his colleagues in the Boulder Police Department will

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

continue this evidentiary review, will continue to ferret out whatever they can ferret out. There will be continuing forensic analysis. There will be continuing consultation.

This case has come to a grand jury posture in the hopes that the use of the subpoena power, the use of the confidentiality and secrecy provisions would, in fact, provide sufficient evidence to take it forward to a public prosecution; that hope hasn't materialized. We are all sorrowful about that. But that means only that one stage of this case is completed, one other stage, that grand jury stage. And it means that another continues, begins with new -- renewed focus and vigor, if you will. The case now reverts back to the police and back to the investigative prowess of the people that have been assigned and worked their hearts out since this grand jury process has begun.

If we were to stand up here now and detail evidence for you -- of course, that wouldn't be the end of it -- you would all have questions, as you should, and then we'd be discussing back and forth "what does this mean? What does that mean? Where does this lead? Where does that lead?" That cannot help but undermine the continuing evidence collection process, and undermine the ability of prosecution authorities in the future to present that evidence to an unbiased panel that will, in some future -- at some future date, make the decisions about this case. We can't do that under law, we can't do that as a practical matter, and we won't. That's our system of justice; that system of justice continues to go forward today in the murder case involving JonBenet Ramsey as it has and does in all other homicide cases in this county in this state and in this country.

I think that it's important for people to understand the process, and it's important for people to understand that there will be no lessened focus on bringing justice to the killer of JonBenet Ramsey, because the grand jury has finished its work and no charges have been brought.

Thanks.

RITTER: I am Bill Ritter, I'm the district attorney in Denver, Colorado, and I think what I'd like to do is pick up with the comments that Mr. Grant had just made. Out of the prosecutors at the table, I and my office as much as anyone utilized the grand jury as an investigative body. And we have specific examples of situations, 20 years old, homicides that were taken into a grand jury -- a late '70s homicide taken into a grand jury in the early 1980s, first represented in the 1990s, and ultimately two people are in the department of corrections as a result of our grand jury investigation and it's a 20- year period.

So, as I watched Alex last night on the TV and listened, and watched the people who were responding to Alex's comments, and heard so many people say that this really is the death knell for the JonBenet Ramsey investigation, I would just say to you that I think that you are wrong and that this case will continue with respect to the investigation.

There is more to do and we can't talk about that. We're in the unenviable position of telling you that there's more to do without being able to tell you what that is, but to tell you that this case and this investigation isn't over. Grand jury was utilized as a tool and that tool and the purpose of that tool is to make sure that the evidence is explored by a body of citizens, but also to do whatever we can to compel the production of documents and the testimony of witnesses where we might not otherwise hear in the state of Colorado.

The thing that I'll also say is that one of the reasons I'm here today is I had something to do with asking two of the three people involved in the grand jury investigation to get involved in this, and one of those individuals was Mike Kane who's both a professional and a personal associate of mine, and Mitch Morrissey is the chief deputy in my office, Bruce Levin the chief deputy in the Adams County office.

And what I'd like to say is, if you look at the conduct of the grand jury since those individuals began their time with the grand jury in September of 1998, I believe that the conduct has been above reproach, that the investigation has been conducted professionally and that this is not an easy time for any prosecutor when we stand before a group of people and say there's insufficient evidence in a case where not only those of us seated here long for justice, but the world longs for justice.

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

I think the American public yearns for justice in every case where there is harm done to another human being. I think the American public yearns for justice in the sense that people are not treated differently because of their ethnicity or because of their socioeconomic status, or any of those reasons.

I can tell you that the three prosecutors who had this case in front of the grand jury conducted themselves as we would want America's prosecutors to conduct themselves and that, in the final analysis for us as prosecutors, theories are not what we take into courtrooms. Evidence and evidence that meets certain standards is that which are the tools of our trades. It is fundamental to our justice system that we rely on evidence and that we maintain our professional standards and our professional ethics even in cases where the entire American public is asking for justice.

Thank you.

HUNTER: You might now ask yourself: Well, why a press conference? There was a former federal prosecutor that I watched last night that was very critical that we would have a press conference today in light of the restrictions that we have told you about with respect to grand jury secrecy and in light of what both Bob Grant and Bill Ritter have spoken to you about in terms of our inability, under the rules -- under the rule of law to talk about the evidence.

The difference between a federal prosecutor and a state-elected prosecutor is that we, as elected prosecutors have responsibility to the electorate, to the public. We've spent a lot of money in this case and I felt, among other things, that I needed to stand in front of you and take questions about whether that money was wisely spent.

We've spent a lot of time on this. We have exhausted personnel, some, as you know, now not involved in the investigation. It has been an extraordinarily difficult process that has taken great toll on some of the people power involved in this case and I think that we must stand accountable to you, and, of course, in my case, the people in the 20th judicial district. So that's, in part, why we're having this press conference.

And, also, we felt it very important as we individually watched last night and read this morning the take, if you will, and the information that the citizenry was getting. I said a few days ago, and it was reported by some of you, that the grand jury aspect of this case was one phase. And I, you may remember, underscored phase because, as both Bill Ritter and Bob Grant have told you, this is a continuum that we are involved with and there are many steps, as they have hinted, mentioned to you, that are underway as we speak, frankly, and that will be pursued as time goes by.

Now we've all been a little windy here and we're not going to let that eat into your time. So we'll now take questions.

QUESTION: (OFF MIKE) still under an umbrella of suspicion?

HUNTER: They have not been eliminated from the investigation.

Yes.

QUESTION: I have, actually, two questions: the first question and then a follow-up.

Early on in this investigation, you were asked by CNN if you knew who killed JonBenet Ramsey. After a long pause, you said you couldn't discuss it. The fact of the matter is you know who killed that little girl, don't you?

HUNTER: Are you answering that question or are you asking me that question? I don't think it's appropriate for a prosecutor to answer a question like that. Let me just say to you, and hope that you won't take it too much as a dodge, that we really do believe that we need to follow the evidence and we're going to go where it takes us.

We don't think that we can base a decision on our feelings, and I think it's understandable that many in the American public -- I know they have feelings. I have 5, 000 letters and many, many phone calls that tell me their feelings, and I'm not critical of that fact. But prosecutors have to put those feelings to the side as best they can because

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

we're human beings, and I certainly have made mistakes in this case -- but put them aside to the best of our abilities and follow the evidence.

And we've had some people in this case -- involved in this case that got off track, lost objectivity and forget that their charge is to follow the evidence. And I really believe that what these men who sit with me, and what I think is very important, is that we be true to the law. And as was just stated, it is difficult to stand here because I think many will have the impression that there's been a failure. I don't think any of us feel there is a failure. I don't think any of us have any sense of quit in us about this case.

We may never get there, but we're not going to stop working. And if other people are involved, we've talked about it, we're going to be supportive of them.

HUNTER: Next question.

Sorry, I got too long-winded with that.

QUESTION: Follow-up question now.

QUESTION: Mr. Hunter, you just said that Mr. and Mrs. Ramsey are still -- have not been eliminated. Are persons known to you also under suspicion at this time -- identities of people known to you?

HUNTER: We are working a broad spectrum of leads and I can't impress upon you how important it is, in any investigation, not just this one, not to wear blinders so that you lose a sense of objectivity as you pursue different things. Sometimes things come in that we just toss aside because they're ridiculous. Other times, things come in that are sort of halfway and we pursue them. And sometimes they're -- they bear fruit and sometimes they don't. So this is a broad investigation.

QUESTION: I don't know if this is one of those waste-your-time questions, but did the grand jury write a report, were they asked to write one, will it be made public?

HUNTER: That's one of those kinds of questions that I can't answer. Now, I'm trying to figure out how to be fair. First of all, the lighting is very bad, it's hard for me to see you. I really would like Suzanne, maybe, to point to somebody so we...

QUESTION: Alex, have you made a decision about whether you'll run for another term, and how does the status of this case play into your thoughts about that?

HUNTER: I have not made that decision and I would hope -- well, of course I would like everybody to not -- to have the feeling that politics does not play into any of the decision-making that I'm involved in or that any of my colleagues are involved in. We are elected people so there will be many cynics -- I'm probably the worst cynic when it comes to politicians -- who may not buy that. But, you know, this is my seventh term and whether I run again or not is, frankly, not particularly important to me.

QUESTION: Yes, Governor Owens has announced that he may call a special prosecutor in this case. How would that fit in with what these people have already accomplished, and do you think it would be beneficial?

I don't want to second-guess the governor. I also don't want to say anything today -- and I know my colleagues join me in this -- anything that would make it difficult for him to make an objective determination about that under the statutes of Colorado.

You are right, he does -- I think he has -- I think he even has a conference maybe as we're meeting together about that. We are interested in the pursuit of truth, in terms of this case, and if he can assist in that, I don't think any of us

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

would stand in his way. We do hope that since he knows many of us that he will recognize that, as I mentioned at the very outset, there are eight career prosecutors that have made a judgment on the evidence, a judgment that is not very popular as I heard about some poll this morning, and he'll have to take that into careful account it seems to me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The gentleman in the far corner with the hand raise high. That's you, sir.

QUESTION: I'm wondering if -- Mr. Hunter, you said you have an aching heart. Your message to the American public who have followed this for nearly three years...

HUNTER: Pardon? I missed one word.

QUESTION: ... your message to the American public and indeed people in the world who have been following this case for nearly three years and woke up this morning shaking their heads, some of them. I'm wondering your assurances that this case possibly still, after all that we've seen, could be brought to justice?

HUNTER: Every district attorney that sits before you today, and every prosecutor across this country has cases that he or she has solved after four years, five years, 10 years. We've had a couple here in Boulder County, which is a pretty small pond, as you know, just recently that are very old cases that have been solved. We are dealing here with a case that does not involve a corpse in a ditch decomposed that has lay there for a long period of time, where you can't even make an identification. We have evidence in this case that gives us the belief that it deserves our best effort.

We have tried to bring in what I think may be the world's best resources to assist us with this case that we know is important to the American people, and frankly to people outside of our borders. We have gone outside of this country for experts to assist us in some of the very difficult areas that we have to deal with. We are not going to quit on this case. Now, I don't know if the American public or the Boulder public will buy that. But there are eight of us that say that to you and you'll have to make a judgment, the American people will have to make a judgment, others will have to make a judgment on whether we mean that. I guess if we didn't mean, we wouldn't be here today. Why would -- why should we show up?

QUESTION: In regards to the Ramseys, do they still remain under an umbrella of suspicion, or has that changed? Is that the wrong way to describe that?

HUNTER: Well, I don't know who coined this umbrella of suspicion. I'm not being critical by way of my tone. It seems to me that when I say to you that we have not excluded the Ramseys, it answers the question. This umbrella of suspicion is, you know -- they're not excluded.

QUESTION: The wording of your statement was unclear and many people have questions about whether the grand jury decided there was not sufficient evidence to move forward or whether it was you and your prosecution team?

HUNTER: That's a question for the prosecutors. It was a prosecutors' response to you. It is our position -- all eight of us with several hundred years of experience -- it is our position that there is insufficient evidence to file charges against anybody that has been looked at in this investigation.

QUESTION: Did you get a true bill signed by the grand jury, and how many dissenters were there, if there were?

HUNTER: Ken, you need to read the statute about grand jury secrecy.

Next question.

QUESTION: I wanted to ask a question about what was not presented to the grand jury. I understand there were a few individuals that tried to send a certified packet of information to the foreman of the grand jury, and I understand under Colorado law you can send it to either the district attorney or the foreman of the grand jury. And one individual certified mail was intercepted by law enforcement, and so why wasn't the foreman allowed to have this information

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

shown to him even though the law allows individuals or the public to submit information to the foreman of the grand jury? I'm talking about Dr. Robert MacFarlane (ph).

HUNTER: There was a court order that instructed that, that go to the district attorney's office first.

QUESTION: You said earlier that one of the reasons you wanted to speak to us today was to explain why the -- this expense of the grand jury was undertaken and the time and the money was spent. So can you tell us, did you gain anything from the time and the money that was invested in the grand jury process? Did you learn anything that would move this case forward?

HUNTER: Yes. Yes, the case was significantly advanced because of the work of this grand jury.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE)

HUNTER: Mike Kane is going to return to Pennsylvania sometime in the near future. I have money in my budget to continue to have Mr. Kane be involved in this case as a member of the prosecution task force. District Attorney Bill Ritter and District Attorney Bob Grant have authorized -- the two men that have worked so hard who are here with me today and with you --to continue in our role as prosecutors in an ongoing investigation. And as Bob Grant said to you, this case in terms of the way things are done, at least in Colorado -- I'll speak for Colorado -- the case goes back for investigation to the police department. The investigation has been in the hands of the prosecutors in the grand jury up to this point. It will now go back with assignments, with direction, from the prosecution task force.

QUESTION: As a follow-up question, I know you say the case was advanced and you have gotten more information, how much stronger do you think the case is now as opposed to what it was a year ago?

HUNTER: The case is stronger as a result of the work of the grand jury.

Mike, did you want to comment at all on your plans in terms of -- I think they might like to hear from you.

KANE: Well, I was, as you know, I was brought out -- I first got involved in this case, I guess, back in March of 1998, when Bill Ritter and I had been talking and Alex called me to ask me about what a grand jury might be able to do to assist in the investigation? And I eventually came onboard to do that. I think it's important to understand that what's the grand jury's role in the spectrum of efforts that are made in any kind of criminal investigation. When you need to go to court, you have to be a lawyer to do that.

And a court proceeding -- grand jury proceedings are court proceedings, and so when a police agency, an investigative agency is conducting an investigation and they need compulsory process to get statements from witnesses or to get documents or other types of tangible evidence, they don't have that. They can do it through a search warrant, if they have probable cause to show that it's evidence of a crime. But the most traditional way and the most expedient way to get that evidence is to put the case into a grand jury and use the grand jury subpoena power.

As far as my role in it, I see my role as having assisted the district attorney, Alex Hunter, in taking that case through the grand jury, utilizing the grand jury subpoena power to develop evidence that becomes part of the whole package of evidence in this case. In any case where a grand jury gets involved and the grand jury's term expires or the need for the grand jury's resources have been exhausted, it go backs to the people that do the investigation and that's the police department. And so our role as prosecutors becomes more of an advisory role to the police department. We work together with the police department, and I see my role at this point as doing exactly that.

QUESTION: Does the evidence that exists, although it's insufficient, does it paint a consistent picture, or do you have some evidence in there that also takes you down some other roads?

HUNTER: I'm not going to get into questions of evidence.

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

QUESTION: Alex, why weren't John and Patsy called? I don't know if this is something you can address. Why weren't they called?

HUNTER: I can't address that. I'm not going to talk about what the grand jury did, or what the grand jury didn't do, or who did appear or who didn't appear. It don't think it's appropriate under the law.

QUESTION: For Michael Kane please.

You've worked for more than a year with this grand jury. There's been a lot of disappointment expressed in the last couple of days. Can you tell us whether they were disappointed in the outcome?

KANE: I really don't want to talk about what the grand jury -- how they reacted or not. I mean, that's a matter of occurring before the grand jury, and that's governed by the rules of secrecy. I think, though, it's important to say that every day that goes by, that a child has been murdered and no one has been apprehended and prosecuted for that is a sad day. And I don't think any of us here look at yesterday as any sadder than any other day that's been in this investigation or any other investigation involving particularly children that are murdered. The grand jury's termination was the end of a certain aspect of this investigation, and so I don't think that you can quantify one day as being sadder than another. And as far as the grand jury is concerned, that's up to them.

QUESTION: This is for Mr. Hunter.

You once looked into the cameras and told the killer: You will not get away with what you've done, very firmly. What's your message to the killer now?

HUNTER: I think the message -- by the way, if I had that to do again, I might have done it a little differently. I thought I might smoke the killer out, and I didn't.

I think, frankly, that the killer, or killers, today, looking at this panel, if you will, have heard it said by all of us, in one way or another, almost all of us, that we are going to continue our efforts.

You know, if this had just been, frankly, Boulder, Colorado, I mentioned, kind of a small pond, and a D.A. that might be a big fish in a small pond -- I don't think there has ever been a case in the nation with as much high-caliber power, in terms of prosecution, as this one. I don't think I know of a case where another elected D.A. chose in the hopes that he could build public confidence, brought together the kind of team that I have. I think that was a good thing it do. I think it was important because the citizenry cared. And if I were the killer, I'm not sure that I would like this group looking for me.

QUESTION: I wanted to direct this question to Mr. Kane.

Alex has said that all eight of you felt that the evidence was insufficient. There has definitely been a lot of talk about you in particular sort of leading the grand jury investigation, and the notion that you wanted an indictment here, that you thought there was enough evidence. Did you think the evidence was insufficient? And was there ever a point during the grand jury investigation that you or anyone else on the team thought that you might have had enough and then you changed your mind?

KANE: Let me just say this. There is absolutely no dissent in any respect to the decision that was made in this case. Every one of us, the career prosecutors as well as the elected prosecutors in this case, looked at all the evidence in this case, and all of us, from our hearts and with our professional expertise from many years in court, many years presenting cases to petit juries, concluded without a doubt that this case is not viable at the present time.

During the course of the investigation, it's an irrelevant consideration, because it -- As Yogi Berra said, "It ain't over until it's over." And you wait until you've used the grand jury resources to gather everything, and then you make

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

that decision. And when that was done, the decision was unanimous.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) the jurors were released, for example, a while back because something had been determined. I know you can't talk specifically about what the jurors were doing then. But with regard to your team, was there ever a point that people thought we might be able to go forward now, and then you stopped and said, maybe we should wait?

KANE: This case has just been rife with speculation, and people will read into everything. They'll read into what time we get up in the morning that it has some significance. What the reasons were behind that, I don't want to address, and I'll leave you to your own speculations on that. But as I said, the decision has to be made at the conclusion of all the evidence being gathered, and that decision was unanimous.

QUESTION: Alex, the governor this morning said that they got indication in their office last week that there would be no charges filed, and I want to know how could that happen when the grand jury didn't finish their work until yesterday?

HUNTER: I had no conversation with anybody in the governor's office.

QUESTION: Inasmuch as this grand jury worked diligently for 13 months on a case that's now closing in on three years. And now you say the grand jury phase, with all the subpoena powers of the grand jury -- this phase is over.

HUNTER: Yes.

QUESTION: Why should we, or the American public have the confidence that you could bring this case to closure at any time -- five years, 10 years, 20 years -- inasmuch as you have the most powerful tools in the criminal justice system at your disposal and you still couldn't get any closer than you have.

HUNTER: Let me talk about the federal system for a minute, because, you know, we don't use the grand jury in Boulder that much -- and some of my colleagues may have something they want to add to your question. There are -- in the federal system, you will see a homicide investigation that would fall under their jurisdiction go through three or four grand juries. I mean, the fact that we've had a grand jury term that was extended expire here does not prevent me from, if appropriate, having another grand jury take a look at an issue and exercise the very special powers that they have to compel testimony and to produce documents. So there is that flexibility, depending on the direction that the investigation might take.

But case after case, in all of our jurisdictions, you'll see grand jury after grand jury, and you will see many years pass. I think I've been -- I wish that there could be a story or two that would talk about cases that get solved after three years, because there seems to be a public perception that, you know, you get past -- well, first in this case it was six months and then it was a year. But all of us, as I mentioned earlier, have cases that have been taken down and activated because something new has come along, cases that have been solved, convictions gained, and there isn't anybody here that doesn't think that that's a possibility.

QUESTION: You referred to "killer or killers." Almost three years after this homicide, do you know whether it is one or more suspects? And should the parents of Boulder be worried about the safety of their children?

HUNTER: I'm not going to speak to the numbers. I suppose it could be three or four. You're asking me to speculate, and I don't think that that's appropriate.

We had -- excuse me, I didn't complete his question. Let me just say this. There is a story this morning in the local paper about a break-in in an apartment and an attempted assault, and I think that citizens need to be diligent, in terms of being protective of themselves and their children, at all times.

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

QUESTION: Mr. Hunter, you talked before about many steps that are going to be continuing, and Mr. Grant talked about continued forensic testing. Could you elaborate on some of these steps and define -- you talked about the prosecutors who will be staying the role of the police department in the continuing many steps.

HUNTER: Well, you know, I don't think any of you would expect me to lay out, you know, our strategy, and our tactics, and exactly what we're doing today or what we might be doing tomorrow. But in the last few days, I've been talking to some people that are forensic people, that are working on matters that are important to this case, and I don't want to go into any detail on that. I don't think that would be smart to do. I think it could provide information to someone that may have an adverse interest in what we're doing.

QUESTION: Alex?

HUNTER: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: I wonder if you might assess the performance in the role of the news media in this case. And feel free to be specific.

(LAUGHTER)

HUNTER: I think I'd burn up your remaining time. Well, let me say this. You know, I have to confess that there -- you know, I don't have much skin left at this point in time, and it does feel funny walking around without skin. At the same time, you know, I think that the citizens in this country are able to evaluate the various types of media that are presented to them. I see that in some of the letters I get.

I really do think they are generally good sifters, and I think that when we're in public office, that it is appropriate to be subjected to criticism. I think it keeps everybody on their toes. So, you know, I think that there's a high brand of journalism, and there's a low brand, I think of journalism out there, and I think people can make distinctions between the two. And I think it's a reality, and I think we -- if you can't handle it, you ought to go do something else.

GRANT: Let me say something else. Let me say something else.

As most of you know, Alex early on asked me to be somewhat of a spokesman for the -- for the prosecution team, primarily to dispel misinformation, rumor, innuendo and hysteria in the media. I don't know whether I've done a good job of that or not, but I've tried. But let me make one comment about the behavior of the media in general in this case.

And that is that you, for large -- in large part, caused the necessity of the grand jury work, caused the problems associated with people who may or may not have had information, but were going to be damned if they were going to give it to anybody and have sound trucks and journalists with flailing arms and microphones chase them down the street.

That is a problem in journalism in America today. And I think that's a problem that you, as an institution, have to address. Not the problem of getting the information to the public. We all are devoted to that. In public service we have to be devoted to that. But the problem of harassing individuals who may be part of an investigative process to the point that they don't want to be involved, I think that's something that you have to address for yourselves.

HUNTER: I can't...

QUESTION: Alex, you were talking earlier about accountability. Clearly, prior to the grand jury being convened, there were -- this case was marred by a series of unauthorized, inaccurate and sometimes quite misleading leaks from law enforcement, details of the case. If the grand jury proceedings and everything that happened in there remain secret, how do we get some kind of accountability for the actions of the law enforcement community? And how do we have any confidence at all that the same law enforcement officials who -- or at least some of the same ones who are leaking

ALEX HUNTER HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE REGARDING JONBENET RAMSEY CASE FDCH Political
Transcripts October 14, 1999, Thursday

this information in the beginning, are now handling the case again?

HUNTER: Well, you know, you're not being specific. That's sort of a broad question. I can remember, I think there was an article in "Vanity Fair" that appeared -- appeared to have been leaked by a police officer. I never saw that to be established, and frankly, these allegations about leaks from the police department or the D.A.'s office, I haven't seen those established.

QUESTION: Alex, have you established, or do you have a pretty good idea about motive? And if you don't, and I realize that maybe isn't essential in bringing charges, but if you don't how much of an impediment has that been as far as bringing charge?

HUNTER: Dick, I'm not going to speak to motive.

QUESTION: Alex, will you continue to be daily involved in the case as you've been, and will Mike Kane be daily involved until his contract is up with you? And then after that what happens? Will have you somebody assigned to it full time?

HUNTER: You know, Mike's contract has been up for sometime. I think you may have forgotten that. I didn't want to remind him. But as he mentioned to you, he's going to be staying on and I guess in contact with me on a regular basis. I don't know if it will be daily. I would hope it might be as often as daily, and I want to keep him in touch with the Boulder Police Department, because he has a wonderful relationship with them.

I'm going to be relying on Mike Kane. And if and when we develop a case, I would want Mike to come back to be involved in its trial. I would want Bruce Levine and Mitch Morrissey, and their bosses have told me that if we are able to develop a case that they will be able to be involved in the prosecution. They know so much about the case. It's in their blood, and they're not going to walk away from it. And as I mentioned in my opening remarks, I don't think there is any of us that feels any sense of quit about this case.

I think this lady didn't get a chance.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) suspects, "I'm not going to talk about numbers. It could be three or four. You're asking me to speculate."

HUNTER: Yes, but see, that was not -- I don't think that was a good choice of words, because now you're going to speculate that it's three or four or five. I just don't want to speak to you on what we think in terms of the numbers, and I take back what I said.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE)

HUNTER: You know, I have said "killer or killers" from the beginning, and I would hope that you would not make more of that than is intended by me.

Thank you very much.

END

NOTES:

Unknown - Indicates speaker unknown.

Inaudible - Could not make out what was being said.

off mike - Indicates could not make out what was being said.

PERSON: BILL RITTER (91%);