

Opening P +  
Sgt Brown 34  
Hair 48  
Moss 59  
Norton 77

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA  
TRIAL DIVISION - CRIMINAL SECTION

COMMONWEALTH : MARCH TERM, 1984  
: NO. 568-PIC GENLY  
: PIC WEAPON  
: 569-INVOL MANSL  
VS. : 570-MURDER, VOL MANSL  
: 571-CRIM CONSPIRACY  
: 572-PIC GENLY  
: PIC WEAPON  
: 573-SIMPLE ASSAULT  
: AGGVD ASSAULT  
MAJOR GEORGE TILLERY : 574-CRIM CONSPIRACY

MAY 9, 1985  
COURTROOM 253, CITY HALL  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

RECORD FILED IN  
SUPERIOR COURT

DEC 17 2008

PHILADELPHIA  
BEFORE: THE HONORABLE JOHN A. GEISZ, J.  
AND A JURY

APPEARANCES:

BARBARA CHRISTIE, ESQUIRE,  
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
FOR THE COMMONWEALTH

JOSEPH SANTAGUIDA, ESQUIRE,  
FOR THE DEFENDANT

DAVID A. DEIK, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER  
A COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

FILED IN  
THE COURT  
AUG 11 1989  
EASTERN  
DISTRICT

RECORD FILED IN SUPERIOR COURT

SEP 22 1987

Philadelphia

RECORD FILED IN SUPERIOR COURT

NOV 24 1988

RECEIVED

Philadelphia

CLERK OF COURT SESSIONS

IN YOUR DELIBERATIONS AS TO WHAT THE OPINION OR PENALTY SHOULD BE IF YOU FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY. THE QUESTION OF GUILT AND THE QUESTION OF PENALTY ARE DECIDED SEPARATELY. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE JUDGE TO FIX THE PENALTY WHENEVER THE DEFENDANT IS FOUND GUILTY, EXCEPT THAT THE JURY FIXES THE PENALTY WHEN A DEFENDANT IS FOUND GUILTY OF FIRST DEGREE MURDER OR SECOND DEGREE MURDER.

POSSIBLE PENALTIES SHOULD NOT INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION ON THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN PROVEN GUILTY. A JURY'S VERDICT MUST BE UNANIMOUS TO BE VALID. IN THE JURY ROOM YOU WILL DISCUSS THE CASE AMONGST YOURSELVES BUT ULTIMATELY EACH OF YOU WILL HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR OWN MINDS.

AFTER THE VERDICT IS ANNOUNCED IN OPEN COURT, YOU MAY BE CALLED ON INDIVIDUALLY TO SAY WHETHER YOU AGREE WITH THE VERDICT. EACH OF YOU WOULD HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY AS A JUROR WHICH YOU CANNOT SHIRK. YOU MUST DO YOUR BEST THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL TO FULFILL YOUR GREAT RESPONSIBILITY AS A MEMBER OF THE JURY.

THAT COMPLETES MY OPENING REMARKS. MISS CHRISTIE.

MISS CHRISTIE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONDR. WITH SUBMISSION TO THE COURT, COUNSEL, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, GOOD MORNING. YOU'RE NOW NO

LONGER MEMBERS OF THE JURY PANEL. BUT AS YOU WELL KNOW NOW, YOU'RE MEMBERS OF THE JURY, JUDGES OF THE FACTS AND SWORN TO TRULY AND TO FAIRLY TRY THIS CASE.

AT THIS TIME, IT'S THE OPPORTUNITY AND I CONSIDER IT THE DUTY OF THE COMMONWEALTH TO MAKE WHAT IS KNOWN AS AN OPENING STATEMENT TO YOU. AND AN OPENING STATEMENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IS JUST THAT, IT'S A STATEMENT. IT'S NOT EVIDENCE. IT'S NOT ARGUMENT. IT'S NOT INTENDED TO PERSUADE. CLOSING ARGUMENT WILL OCCUR AT THE END OF THE TRIAL.

AN OPENING STATEMENT OR A STATEMENT MADE TO THE JURY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CASE IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADVISING YOU WHAT IT IS THE COMMONWEALTH EXPECTS ITS CASE TO SHOW BY THE EVIDENCE AND BY THE WITNESSES THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO YOU FROM THAT WITNESS STAND AND BY THE OBJECTS, BY THE PHOTOGRAPHS, BY THE SKETCHES WHICH THE JUDGE MAY PERMIT YOU TO VIEW DURING THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES WHO DO TESTIFY.

NOW, YOU HEARD ME MENTION AT THE INTRODUCTION TO THE JURY PANEL A LENGTHY LIST OF POSSIBLE NAMES THAT MAY BE MENTIONED OR WITNESSES WHO MAY TESTIFY AND I ADVISE YOU, AS I'M SURE THE JUDGE WILL ADVISE YOU DURING THE COURSE OF TRIAL, THAT CERTAINLY IT'S NOT THE NUMBER OF WITNESSES WHO TESTIFY BUT IT'S WHAT EACH WITNESS SAYS THAT IS IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO CONSIDER WITH

REGARD TO DECIDING YOUR VERDICT IN THIS CASE.

SOME OF THE WITNESSES WILL BE LENGTHIER THAN OTHERS. SOME WITNESSES MAY BE WHAT YOU CALL TECHNICAL WITNESSES OR WITNESSES TO ESTABLISH SUCH THINGS WHICH ARE REQUIRED TO BE ESTABLISHED IN EVERY HOMICIDE CASE, AS THAT MISTER HOLLIS, JOSEPH HOLLIS, WAS A LIFE IN BEING, WAS A REAL LIVE PERSON BEFORE THE NIGHT OF OCTOBER THE 22ND, 1976, WHEN HE WAS SHOT AND KILLED.

AND SO YOU MAY HEAR, FROM A TECHNICAL SENSE, TO ESTABLISH MISTER HOLLIS WAS ALIVE, THAT HE WAS A HUMAN BEING. YOU MAY HEAR FROM HIS MOTHER MRS. HOLLIS, EMILY HOLLIS, WHO WILL TELL YOU THAT SHE TALKED TO HIM, SAW HIM THE DAY BEFORE HIS DEATH AND SHE TALKED TO HIM ON THE PHONE THE DAY OF HIS DEATH. THE MAN WAS ALIVE, HE WAS WELL UNTIL SHE WAS NOTIFIED AT A LATER POINT ON THE 22ND OF OCTOBER, 1976, UNTIL MRS. HOLLIS WAS NOTIFIED TO COME TO THE MORGUE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF, ANOTHER REQUIREMENT IN A HOMICIDE CASE, TECHNICALLY ESTABLISHING THE IDENTITY OF HER DEAD SON IN THE OFFICE OF THE MEDICAL EXAMINER.

YOU MAY ALSO HEAR FROM TYPES OF WITNESSES WHO WOULD TESTIFY AS TO CERTAIN CHAIN OF CUSTODY MATTERS, WITNESSES WHO WILL TELL YOU, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT -- POLICE WITNESSES, THAT THEY RESPONDED TO THE AREA, THAT THEY TOOK CERTAIN PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE INSIDE AND THE

OUTSIDE OF THE POOLROOM AS IT APPEARED TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY GOT THERE THAT EVENING, THAT FRIDAY EVENING OF 10-22-76 AND THAT THEY PERFORMED CERTAIN DUTIES OF THE MOBILE CRIME DETECTION UNIT.

THOSE DUTIES INCLUDE TAKING PICTURES OF THE CRIME SCENE, COLLECTING CERTAIN ITEMS OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE, WHATEVER MAY BE FOUND THERE, AND SUBMITTING THEM TO VARIOUS UNITS, DEPARTMENTS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR WHATEVER EXAMINATION AND ANALYSIS IS POSSIBLE TO BE DONE ON THOSE ITEMS.

AGAIN, YOU MAY HEAR FROM WITNESSES WHO WILL TESTIFY AS TO THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY OR THE CHAIN OF TRANSPORTATION CONCERNING THE INDIVIDUAL WHO SURVIVED IN THIS CASE, JOHN PICKENS; HOW THE POLICE RESPONDED TO THE LOCATION ABOUT A BLOCK AWAY FROM THE POOLROOM WHERE MISTER PICKENS HAD RUN TO AND COLLAPSED AND TOOK HIM FROM THAT LOCATION TO TEMPLE HOSPITAL WHERE HE WAS ADMITTED AND WHERE HE WAS TREATED AND WHERE THE HOSPITAL RECORDS WILL INDICATE 3 WEEKS OR SO OF TREATMENT RESULTED IN HIS BEING DISCHARGED.

SO, YOU'LL HEAR FROM VARIOUS AND DIFFERENT TYPES AND LENGTHS OF WITNESSES. BUT IT'S NOT THE NUMBER OF WITNESSES AND IT'S REALLY NOT THE TYPE OF WITNESSES. IT'S WHAT YOU HEAR THE WITNESSES SAY AND HOW YOU SEE AND WATCH AND OBSERVE AND LISTEN TO THEM

TESTIFY. AND SO WHAT I TELL YOU NOW, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IS AN OUTLINE. YOU CAN LIKEN IT TO A TABLE OF CONTENTS IN A BOOK FOR PLEASURE OR INSTRUCTIVE READING. IT'S TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF WHAT IT IS THAT THE COMMONWEALTH EXPECTS ITS CASE TO PROVE.

NOW, YOU HEARD THE CHARGES READ AGAINST THE DEFENDANT. YOU HEARD THAT THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED WITH MURDER, THE UNLAWFUL KILLING OF ANOTHER HUMAN BEING. HE'S CHARGED WITH AGGRAVATED ASSAULT, SERIOUS BODILY INJURY TO ANOTHER HUMAN BEING. HE'S CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY, BEING PART OF A PLAN TO DO THESE THINGS, TO COMMIT AGGRAVATED ASSAULT, TO COMMIT MURDER. AND POSSESSING INSTRUMENTS OF CRIME GENERALLY, HAVING A WEAPON, IN THIS CASE, THE GUN.

NOW, THE COMMONWEALTH EXPECTS TO PROVE THESE CHARGES BY EVIDENCE, BY WITNESSES, BY TESTIMONY FIRSTLY OF POLICE WHO RESPONDED TO THE POOLROOM THAT EVENING, FRIDAY, 10-22-76. THEY GOT A RADIO CALL OF A SHOOTING AND A HOSPITAL CASE. GOT TO THE POOLROOM.

WHEN THEY GOT THERE, COUPLE PEOPLE MILLING AROUND OUTSIDE, BASED ON WHAT THEY WERE TOLD BY ONE INDIVIDUAL WHO THEY LATER FOUND OUT TO BE NAMED WILLIAM ARNOLD. POLICE LOOKED INTO THE POOLROOM. PART OF THE WINDOW WAS PAINTED ABOUT TWO-THIRDS UP THE WAY, THE WINDOW WAS PAINTED. THEY LOOKED IN BECAUSE THEY

COULDN'T GET IN. COULDN'T GET IN THROUGH THE DOOR.

THEY LOOKED IN THROUGH THE POOLROOM AND LOOKING ABOVE THE PAINTED PART, WERE ABLE TO LOOK DOWN AND SEE A BODY OF A YOUNG MAN LYING ON THE FLOOR BY THE POOL TABLE.

SO THE POLICE, AFTER MAKING THAT OBSERVATION WENT BACK TO THE CARS THAT HAD ALSO RESPONDED AND ALSO COME TO THE POOLROOM, AND THEY TOOK A SLEDGE HAMMER AND THEY BROKE THROUGH THE DOOR IN ORDER TO GET IN.

WHEN THEY GOT IN THEY'LL TELL YOU WHAT THEY SAW. AND WHAT THEY IMMEDIATELY SAW AND NOTICED OF COURSE WAS A YOUNG MAN LYING ON THE FLOOR. THAT YOUNG MAN'S NAME WAS JOSEPH HOLLIS. THAT YOUNG MAN WAS TAKEN TO THE HOSPITAL, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL WHERE HE WAS PRONOUNCED DEAD OF GUNSHOT WOUNDS.

POLICE WILL TELL YOU -- RESPONDING AND ARRIVING POLICE WILL TELL YOU OTHER THINGS THAT THEY NOTICED ABOUT THAT POOLROOM. FIRST OF ALL, THEY NOTICED THAT NOT A SOUL WAS IN THERE OTHER THAN MISTER HOLLIS, OF COURSE AND THAT THEY NOTICED LYING AROUND THE POOLROOM HATS AND COATS AND NO PEOPLE.

THEY NOTICED A SET OF KEYS, KEYS THAT HAD A CADILLAC INSIGNIA ON THEM OR CENTER CITY CADILLAC INSIGNIA AND THAT WHEN THEY SAW THESE THINGS, THE POLICE WHO WERE FAMILIAR WITH THAT POOLROOM FROM HAVING

RESPONDED THERE BEFORE, AND KNEW THAT POOLROOM TO BE MANAGED BY A GUY BY THE NAME OF WILLIAM FRANKLIN, THE POLICE LEFT THAT POOLROOM AFTER FINDING NO ONE IN THERE, NO OTHER INJURED PERSONS AND NO PEOPLE HIDING IN THERE. POLICE LEFT THAT POOLROOM AND WENT TO A RESTAURANT ABOUT A BLOCK -- ACTUALLY IT'S A SMALL BLOCK, A HALF A BLOCK AWAY AT THE CORNER OF 11TH AND HUNTINGDON, NEXT CORNER DOWN.

THEY KNEW THAT RESTAURANT TO ALSO BE MANAGED BY WILLIAM FRANKLIN AND THEY WENT INTO THAT RESTAURANT AND JUST HAPPENED TO FIND 2 PEOPLE THERE BY THE NAME OF FRED RAINEY AND EUGHENIA JONES, WITHIN MINUTES AFTER RESPONDING TO THE POOLROOM.

AND THEY TOOK THOSE 2 PEOPLE IN FOR QUESTIONING BECAUSE THEY KNEW THOSE 2 PEOPLE. THEY KNEW THEM TO BE ASSOCIATES WITH A MAN BY THE NAME OF ALFRED CLARK, A MAJOR FIGURE KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN DRUG TRAFFICKING IN NORTH PHILADELPHIA.

AND YOU'LL HEAR ALSO FROM POLICE WHO FURTHER INVESTIGATED BECAUSE WHEN THEY WENT INTO THE POOLROOM, LOOKED AROUND, CAME OUT OF THE POOLROOM, THEY NOTICED A YELLOW CADILLAC OUT THERE.

POLICE WERE FAMILIAR WITH THIS CAR AND THEY KNEW THIS TO BE ALFRED CLARK'S CADILLAC; SEEN IT; STOPPED IT, WHATEVER, ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS. BUT



WHEN THEY WENT TO THE RESTAURANT AND SAW MISTER RAINEY AND MISTER JONES THERE, AND RETURNED FROM THE RESTAURANT WITH THEM TO THE POOLROOM, A YELLOW CADILLAC WAS GONE.

SO THE POLICE PUT OUT INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO A PARTIAL TAG NUMBER OF THAT CADILLAC AND A DESCRIPTION OF THAT CADILLAC. AND YOU WILL HEAR FROM OTHER POLICE OFFICERS WHO WERE PATROLLING IN THE AREA THAT 15, 20, 25 MINUTES AFTER THE POLICE RESPONDED TO THE POOLROOM AND WITHIN A DISTANCE OF SEVERAL BLOCKS AWAY, AN OFFICER PRESSLEY ON PATROL, HEARING THAT RADIO CALL INFORMATION, STOPS THAT CADILLAC.

AND WHO'S IN IT AS A PASSENGER IS ALFRED CLARK. CADILLAC IS BEING DRIVEN BY A GUY BY THE NAME OF FRANK JUNIUS, ANOTHER ASSOCIATE OF ALFRED CLARK, ALSO KNOWN AS FRANK RAVENELL, BROTHER OF JAMES RAVENELL.

THE MEN IN THERE THE POLICE BUCKED UP AGAINST A WALL OF SILENCE. BUT BECAUSE IN THE LAW HOMICIDE HAS NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, THERE'S NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON A MURDER CASE, THE POLICE CONTINUED TO INVESTIGATE. AND THEY CONTINUED TO INVESTIGATE UP TO AND UNTIL 1980.

AND IN 1980, MAY OF 1980, THEY ENCOUNTERED AN INDIVIDUAL BY THE NAME OF EMANUEL CLAITT AND HOW THEY

ENCOUNTERED THAT INDIVIDUAL WAS THAT MISTER CLAITT WAS IN CUSTODY ON HIS OWN THEFT AND ROBBERY CHARGES AND MISTER CLAITT WAS QUESTIONED ABOUT THE DEATH OF A FRIEND AND A PARTNER, A BUSINESS PARTNER OF HIS BY THE NAME OF SAMUEL GOODWIN.

MISTER CLAITT TOLD THE POLICE WHAT HE KNEW ABOUT THE DEATH OF SAMUEL GOODWIN AND HE ALSO TOLD THE POLICE WHAT HE KNEW ABOUT, BY THAT TIME, WHAT HAD BEEN THE ASSASSINATION OF ALFRED CLARK AND MISTER CLAITT CONTINUED TO SPEAK WITH THE POLICE. THE POLICE TURNED OVER THEIR FILES, THEIR OLD FILES AND THEY ASKED MISTER CLAITT WHAT IF ANYTHING HE KNEW ABOUT THE DEATH OF JOE HOLLIS IN THAT POOLROOM IN 1976 AT HUNTINGDON AND WARNOCK.

AND EMANUEL CLAITT TOLD THE POLICE WHAT HE KNEW. EMANUEL CLAITT WILL TELL YOU WHAT HE KNEW. EMANUEL CLAITT WILL TELL YOU THAT AT THAT TIME, IN OCTOBER OF 1976, THAT HE WORKED FOR AND WORKED WITH A MAN BY THE NAME OF -- YOU'VE ALREADY HEARD -- OF ALFRED CLARK.

WHO IS ALFRED CLARK? ALFRED CLARK IS THE BOSS. HE WAS THE CONTROLLER OF THE DRUG TRAFFIC IN NORTH PHILADELPHIA. EMANUEL CLAITT WAS WHAT YOU MIGHT CALL A MIDDLE LEVEL DISTRIBUTOR. GOT HIS DRUGS FROM THE SUPPLIER ALFRED CLARK; SOLD THEM TO OTHER PEOPLE

WHO THEN SOLD THEM ON THE STREET. AND IN THAT ORGANIZATION EMANUEL CLAITT WORKED FOR AND UNDER ALFRED CLARK.

WHO ELSE WAS IN THAT ORGANIZATION? EMANUEL CLAITT WILL TELL YOU ALFRED CLARK'S RIGHT-HAND MAN WAS THIS DEFENDANT, MAJOR GEORGE TILLERY, WHO WORKED WITH CLARK AND SUBDEVELOPED, SHALL WE SAY A SPECIALTY INTO METHAMPHETAMINE DRUG PART OF THE ORGANIZATION.

MISTER CLAITT WILL TELL YOU AROUND ABOUT THAT TIME THERE WERE 2 RIVAL FACTIONS, 2 RIVAL FACTIONS IN THE DRUG ORGANIZATION, THE NORTH PHILADELPHIA GROUP CONTROLLED BY ALFRED CLARK AND A WEST PHILADELPHIA GROUP OF WHOM AN EQUAL LEVEL TO CLARK'S SUPERIOR WAS A MAN BY THE NAME OF SYLVESTER WHITE. UNDER MISTER WHITE, SYLVESTER WHITE, WORKING FOR HIM IN THE WEST PHILADELPHIA FACTION OF THE DRUG ORGANIZATION WERE 2 GENTLEMEN WHOSE NAMES YOU'VE ALREADY HEARD MENTIONED, JOHN PICKENS, ALSO KNOWN AS JOHNNY CAKES AND JOSEPH HOLLIS.

MISTER CLAITT WILL TELL YOU THAT IN THAT FALL OF 1976, THERE WAS A RIFT, A RIFT BETWEEN THE 2 ORGANIZATIONS AND MORE SPECIFICALLY AND AROUND ABOUT THE TIME OF THE POOLROOM KILLING A FREE-LANCE OR A FLOATER DRUG SELLER BY THE NAME OF MARK GARRICK WHO HAD BEEN PRIMARILY ALIGNED WITH THE NORTH PHILADELPHIA PART

OF THE ORGANIZATION, BEGAN TO TAKE AND DISTRIBUTE AND DEAL MORE SO WITH WEST PHILADELPHIA AND BECAUSE OF THIS, A PACKAGE -- BY PACKAGE I MEAN NARCOTICS, A PACKAGE THAT MISTER GARRICK WAS DEALING WITH THAT HAD BEEN FRONTED OR HAD BEEN CO-INVESTED BY MEMBERS OF THE WEST PHILADELPHIA ORGANIZATION, WAS STOLEN. IT WAS HIJACKED BY ALFRED CLARK, MEMBERS OF THE NORTH PHILADELPHIA ORGANIZATION.

AND AS A RESULT OF THIS HIJACKING, A MEETING OCCURRED APPROXIMATELY 2 DAYS BEFORE THE KILLING IN THE POOLROOM. A MEETING OCCURRED AT A HOUSE IN WEST PHILADELPHIA, HOUSE OF DANA GOODMAN. DANA GOODMAN WAS THE COCAINE CONNECTION FOR ALFRED CLARK'S NORTH PHILADELPHIA ORGANIZATION.

AND A MEETING WAS CALLED TO RESOLVE THIS SITUATION OF THE HIJACKING OF THE MARK GARRICK PACKAGE. DURING THE COURSE OF THIS MEETING, JOSEPH HOLLIS, JOHN PICKENS AND A MAN BY THE NAME OF GREGORY HILL ENTERED THE MEETING AT WHICH ALFRED CLARK, DANA GOODMAN, MAJOR TILLERY, EMANUEL CLAITT AND OTHERS WERE PRESENT AND DEMANDED TO KNOW WHY GARRICK'S PACKAGE WAS HIJACKED AND WHAT ALFRED CLARK WAS GOING TO DO ABOUT IT.

AND BASICALLY THEY WERE TOLD THAT ALFRED CLARK WASN'T GOING TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT AND IT WAS JUST TOO BAD AND THEY'D HAVE TO TAKE THE LOSS BECAUSE

THE DRUGS WERE ALREADY OUT ON THE STREET.

DURING THE COURSE OF THE MEETING, AN ARGUMENT ERUPTED. THE PARTICIPANTS IN THAT MEETING WERE TOLD THAT THEY'D HAVE TO LEAVE THE GOODMAN HOUSE, PUT THOSE GUNS AWAY AND LEAVE THE GOODMAN HOUSE AND SO THEY DID.

BUT AFTER THAT MEETING, IT WAS ARRANGED BETWEEN SYLVESTER WHITE OF WEST PHILADELPHIA AND ALFRED CLARK OF NORTH PHILADELPHIA, IT WAS ARRANGED THAT THERE SHOULD BE A PEACE MEETING, A PEACE MEETING, P-E-A-C-E, PEACE MEETING TO SETTLE THIS TERRITORIAL AND BUSINESS DISPUTE.

AND THAT PEACE MEETING WAS ARRANGED TO BE AT THE POOLROOM, HUNTINGDON AND WARNOCK AFTER MOSQUE SERVICES, THE MUSLIM SERVICES AT THE MOSQUE AT 13TH AND SUSQUEHANNA.

THAT MEETING WAS TO OCCUR ON FRIDAY, THE 22ND OF OCTOBER, 1976. WHITE WAS TO HAVE HIS PEOPLE THERE, PICKENS AND HOLLIS. AND ALFRED CLARK WAS TO BE PRESENT WITH HIS INDIVIDUALS, CLAITT, MAJOR TILLERY, MAN BY THE NAME OF WILLIAM FRANKLIN AND OTHERS WHOSE NAMES YOU WILL HEAR.

YOU WILL HEAR THAT THAT MEETING DID IN FACT OCCUR. MISTER CLAITT WILL TELL YOU THAT AS THEY ATTENDED THE MOSQUE MEETING AT ABOUT HALFWAY THROUGH THE MOSQUE MEETING HE NOTICED 2 INDIVIDUALS LEAVE, THIS

DEFENDANT MAJOR TILLERY AND ANOTHER MAN WHOSE NAME I'VE MENTIONED, WILLIAM FRANKLIN.

THOSE 2 INDIVIDUALS LEFT THE MOSQUE MEETING. SHORTLY BEFORE THE MEETING ENDED, CLAITT AND THE REMAINING INDIVIDUALS LEFT THE MOSQUE MEETING TO GO TO THE POOLROOM OR THE PEACE MEETING.

AND YOU'LL HEAR MISTER CLAITT TELL YOU THAT THIS MEETING DID OCCUR. ALFRED CLARK INDICATED THAT EVERYONE'S GUN SHOULD BE COLLECTED FROM NORTH PHILADELPHIA. SYLVESTER CLARK INDICATED EVERYONE'S GUN SHOULD BE COLLECTED FROM WEST PHILADELPHIA AND SO THE PEOPLE WHO LEFT THE MOSQUE, LEFT AND WENT TO THE POOLROOM AT HUNTINGDON AND WARNOCK OSTENSIBLY, SUPPOSEDLY FOR A PEACE MEETING.

AND YOU'LL HEAR MISTER CLAITT TELL YOU THAT AS THEY GATHERED AROUND THE POOLROOM TABLE, THOSE PEOPLE WHO LEFT THAT MOSQUE MEETING SHORTLY BEFORE IT ENDED, MISTER CLAITT HAD NOTICED ONE THING AS HE WENT IN, OUTSIDE THAT POOLROOM WAS TILLERY, THE DEFENDANT'S, LINCOLN, BUT TILLERY WAS NOWHERE AROUND, AT LEAST NOT AT THE MOMENT.

MISTER CLAITT WILL TELL YOU THAT AS THE INDIVIDUALS GATHERED AROUND THE POOL TABLE AND ALFRED CLARK BEGAN THE DISCUSSION TO TRY TO RESOLVE THIS CONFLICT, THAT STEPPING FROM BEHIND A PARTITION IN THE

FAR END OF THE POOLROOM AT 11TH AT HUNTINGDON AND WARNOCK CAME MAJOR TILLERY AND WILLIAM FRANKLIN, THE 2 INDIVIDUALS WHO HE HAD EARLIER LEFT THE MEETING, THAT THEY JOINED IN DISCUSSION AROUND THE POOLROOM TABLE AND THAT MAJOR TILLERY BEGAN TO ARGUE WITH JOE HOLLIS CONCERNING THIS PROBLEM OF THE DRUG HIJACKING AND THE MEETING THAT HAD OCCURRED IN THE WEST PHILADELPHIA HOUSE OF DANA GOODMAN'S AND THAT AS THE ARGUMENT CONTINUED, CLARK -- STRIKE THAT. WILLIAM FRANKLIN NOT AT MAJOR TILLERY WHO WERE AT OPPOSITE ENDS OF THE POOL TABLE AND UPON THAT KNOCK BOTH MEN WENT UNDER THEIR RELATIVE ENDS OF THE POOL TABLE. TILLERY AND FRANKLIN CAME UP WITH GUNS. HOLLIS CONTINUED TO ARGUE NOT REALIZING THAT TILLERY HAD A GUN TILLERY STEPPED BACK AND SHOT JOE HOLLIS AND MISTER PICKENS PROTESTING SAID I THOUGHT THIS WAS TO BE A PEACE MEETING. WILLIAM FRANKLIN BESIDE HIM SAID A FEW WORDS OF PROFANITY, SHUT UP AND SHOT MISTER PICKENS, WHO THEN RAN THROUGH AND AWAY AND OUT OF THE POOLROOM TO A BLOCK -- APPROXIMATELY A BLOCK AWAY WHERE HE COLLAPSED AND WAS TAKEN TO THE HOSPITAL BY THE POLICE. MISTER HOLLIS WAS TAKEN TO THE HOSPITAL BY THE POLICE WHO WAS PRONOUNCED DECEASED OF HIS GUNSHOT WOUNDS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YOU'LL HEAR THAT MISTER CLAITT GAVE THIS INFORMATION IN THE STATEMENT TO THE

POLICE IN MAY OF 1980, THAT AS A PART OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN MISTER CLAITT AND THE COMMONWEALTH MISTER CLAITT TESTIFIED FIRSTLY AS A RESULT OF THAT INFORMATION 2 ARREST WARRANTS WERE ISSUED, ONE FOR WILLIAM FRANKLIN WHO WAS ARRESTED IN THE LATTER PART OF MAY, 1980 AND WHOSE TRIAL DOES NOT CONCERN YOU, IN THAT YOU WILL HEAR WITH REGARD TO THE MAJOR TILLERY TRIAL ONLY BUT THAT MISTER CLAITT DID TESTIFY, TESTIFIED AS PART OF THE -- AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN HIMSELF AND THE COMMONWEALTH WHERE MISTER CLAITT PLED GUILTY TO CERTAIN CHARGES.

HE'S IN PRISON, REMAINS IN PRISON, ISOLATED FROM THREATS AND ATTACKS UPON HIS SAFETY. HE'S COMING IN TO TESTIFY TO THE COURT BEFORE YOU CONCERNING THIS MATTER AS HE HAS TESTIFIED ON PRIOR OCCASIONS AND AS HE WILL TESTIFY IN OTHER OCCASIONS CONCERNING INFORMATION HE GAVE TO THE POLICE. AND AS A RESULT OF THAT INFORMATION CONCERNING THE POOLROOM KILLING, AN ARREST WARRANT, AS I'VE TOLD YOU, IS ISSUED FOR WILLIAM FRANKLIN WHO WAS ARRESTED IN THE LATTER PART OF MAY. AN ARREST WARRANT WAS ALSO ISSUED FOR MAJOR TILLERY. YOU'LL HEAR FROM WITNESSES WHO WILL TELL YOU, BOTH POLICE AND CIVILIAN WITNESSES, WHO WILL TELL YOU THAT FOR A PERIOD FROM MAY THE 23RD OF 1980 UNTIL THE END OF 1983, FIRST LOCAL POLICE THEN POLICE WITHIN THE



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA ATTEMPTED TO LOCATE THIS DEFENDANT MAJOR TILLERY IN THE PHILADELPHIA AREA, THEN TO HARRISBURG, THEN NATIONALLY WITH REGARD TO VIRGINIA, FLORIDA, AND SO ON, AND SO FORTH, THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY UNTIL THE DEFENDANT, MAJOR TILLERY, WAS LOCATED SOME 3 YEARS LATER IN NOVEMBER OF 1983, IN SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, UNDER ONE OF MANY NAMES THAT THE DEFENDANT USED DURING THE COURSE OF HIS TRAVELS THROUGH THE COUNTRY, TO EVADE BEING CAPTURED AND DETECTED BY THE POLICE FOR THE OUTSTANDING ARREST WARRANT IN PHILADELPHIA FOR THE KILLING OF JOSEPH HOLLIS AND HIS PARTICIPATION IN THE PLAN TO WOUND JOHN PICKENS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE TESTIMONY, COMMONWEALTH WILL REPRESENT TO YOU, WILL STAND BEFORE YOU IN CLOSING ARGUMENT AND ASK YOU TO DETERMINE ON THE EVIDENCE THAT YOU'VE HEARD IN THIS COURTROOM, FROM THE WITNESSES MENTIONED AND OTHERS, THAT THIS DEFENDANT, MAJOR GEORGE TILLERY, IS GUILTY OF THE WILLFUL, DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED TAKING OF HUMAN LIFE, WHICH IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THE WOUNDING OR CAUSING SERIOUS BODILY INJURY, BEING PART OF A PLAN TO DO SO, AND I BELIEVE THE COURT WILL TELL YOU THAT BEING PART OF A PLAN, ASSESSING EQUAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ALL PERSONS PART OF THAT PLAN, CAUSING SERIOUS BODILY INJURY TO JOHN PICKENS, BEING PART OF THAT PLAN OR

AGREEMENT, CRIME OF CONSPIRACY AND CAUSING SUCH INJURY AND IN TILLERY'S CASE WITH REGARD TO JOSEPH HOLLIS' DEATH, WITH A DEADLY WEAPON, CRIME OF POSSESSING AN INSTRUMENT OF CRIME. I THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: MISTER SANTAGUIDA.

MR. SANTAGUIDA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, COUNSEL, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, THANK GOD THERE ARE 2 THEORIES TO A CASE. I'D LIKE TO THINK THE PURPOSE OF AN OPENING STATEMENT IS TWO-FOLD: NUMBER ONE, IT GIVES US THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN TO YOU WHAT WE'VE DONE UP UNTIL NOW AND IT ALSO GIVES US THE OPPORTUNITY, AS MISS CHRISTIE TOLD YOU, LIKE THE PREFACE OF A BOOK, TO GIVE YOU A SHORT DESCRIPTION OF WHAT WE EXPECT THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW.

NOW, WHAT WE'VE DONE UP UNTIL NOW IS PROBABLY THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF THE CASE. WE'VE SELECTED YOU AS THE JURY. AND YOU WILL SEE THAT IT'S TAKEN US ALMOST AS LONG TO SELECT A JURY AS IT WILL TO TRY THE CASE. I DON'T KNOW IF CONGRATULATIONS ARE THE WORDS THAT ARE IN ORDER BUT WE HAVE THE CONFIDENCE, THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE DEFENSE, THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO SIT AND LISTEN TO THE EVIDENCE, FAIRLY UNBIASEDLY AND REACH A CONCLUSION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE