Just the Molalla Forest Serial Killer Podcast Transcript

Intro [00:00:00] Some content in this podcast is sensitive and may evoke emotional responses or may not be appropriate for younger audiences. Now this is recording. RTI International Center for Forensic Science presents Just Science.

Intro [00:00:30] Welcome to Just Science, a podcast for forensic science professionals and anyone who is interested in learning more about how real crime laboratories work. In Episode Four of the Identification Season Just Science interviews Robert Thompson, Senior Forensic Science Research Manager at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, about his role in the investigation of the Molalla Forest murder. In 1988, Dayton Leroy Rogers was convicted and imprisoned for the serial murder of seven women over the course of three months. Robert Thompson was heavily involved in the investigation and conviction of this killer. Listen along as our guest discusses the intimate details of the case and the years that followed. This season is funded by the National Institute of Justice's Forensic Technology Center of Excellence. Here is your host, Dr. John Morgan.

Dr. John Morgan [00:01:24] And welcome to Just Science, the podcast for forensic science professionals. If you're a forensic science professional or an aspiring one, welcome on board. If you are just an interested bystander, you're welcome to. We're glad to have you. I'm John Morgan, your host with the Forensic Technology Center of Excellence. I'm here today not only with our esteemed producer, Lauren Mangum, but also with our esteemed guest Robert Thompson from the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Robert is a senior forensic science research manager with the Special Programs Office of Forensic Sciences at the National Institute of Standards and Technology and has over 38 years of experience as a forensic scientist and criminalist certified in Criminalistics by ABC, past chairman and current member of AFTE's Certification Program Committee, Fellow of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Distinguished Member of AFTE, court accepted expert in about a billion forensic disciplines and all around good guy. In his many years in forensic science, both from working at NIST on the research side, but also as a practitioner. Robert's been involved in a number of cases. We're going to talk about one that he did when he was with the Oregon State Police, which was the Molalla Forest serial murders, which was, I guess, just about the most notorious set of serial murderers in Oregon history, right?

Robert Thompson [00:02:40] Yes, is for the number and certainly the victims. Yeah.

Dr. John Morgan [00:02:43] And Robert was very heavily involved from the very, very beginning in that case and that case, actually, in terms of sentencing and things like that has had decades, just about worth of professional work for Robert to have. It's been quite the case for you in that regard, hasn't it?

Robert Thompson [00:02:59] Yes, it's the typical definition of what ends in a sentence. It's basically an appeal in this case was multiple appeals, of which I had to testify in every one of the re sentencing.

Dr. John Morgan [00:03:11] So when did you start with Oregon State Police?

Robert Thompson [00:03:13] Started in 1985.

Dr. John Morgan [00:03:15] 1985.

Robert Thompson [00:03:17] Back when dinosaurs ruled the Earth.

Dr. John Morgan [00:03:18] Well, yeah, I was a grad student actually, at the time.

Robert Thompson [00:03:22] I was I was working in forensic MASH units.

Dr. John Morgan [00:03:25] Okay.

Robert Thompson [00:03:26] While you're doing your nice, easy master's and graduate degree.

Dr. John Morgan [00:03:29] Yeah, it was a fun time the 1980s. So were you a criminalist then with OSP?

Robert Thompson [00:03:36] Was a journey level criminalist and I was primarily specific to trace and serology and enzyme and genetics, enzyme genetics. Back then, prior to DNA, later on, I helped set up the DNA laboratory there, but we did a trace serology. All of us went out to crime scenes, everything from homicides to meth labs. For the major cases, at least there was back in the RFLP days.

Dr. John Morgan [00:04:04] Okay. Sure you needed a lot of material for that.

Robert Thompson [00:04:06] Yeah, it's a bit much more material and a lot more time to get any results. Usually your first results came off after extraction and everything about two weeks to maybe a full panel of four loci in a month.

Dr. John Morgan [00:04:20] Nice. So the Molalla Forest murders, what was the name of the individual who was eventually convicted?

Robert Thompson [00:04:26] The other convicted person was named Dayton Leroy Rogers. I think it's always interesting that serial murders always have three names. You know, they always have the middle name in there for some reason.

Dr. John Morgan [00:04:37] But did he have a criminal history before the serial murders?

Robert Thompson [00:04:40] Yes, I actually had one that was of enough concern that people who were his probation officers were warning about him getting to earlier release when he was much younger. But he was legitimate as best people could see for his job. He had a business. He had a wife and kids.

Dr. John Morgan [00:05:01] What was his business?

Robert Thompson [00:05:02] It was in sharpening chainsaws and lawnmowers, lawnmower repairs which became a problem a little later for us to do some of our comparisons. He basically didn't have any criminal history when he was older until we found out what he was truly doing in the evenings and that was killing prostitutes.

Dr. John Morgan [00:05:23] Was that something that he had started to frequent prostitutes just generally, or did he only do it when he was murdering, involving these homicides?

Robert Thompson [00:05:29] Not sure about his proclivities before? He did have some of the prostitutes that were potential victims survived his attacks over the months that he was kind of clustering these crimes. But we assume that was true. Of course, as we've seen over the years, unfortunately, that population of victims is easy to be preyed upon because of their they're on the street. They're obviously in a risky profession, and unfortunately, they become prey to these type of people.

Dr. John Morgan [00:06:03] Do we know when his series of murders started?

Robert Thompson [00:06:07] Yes, I actually I was the examiner on his last homicide where he had a certain M.O., found out later, picked up a prostitute. He had a little pickup truck and had her in a parking lot near a restaurant. And he liked to tie them up, use a knife. And she was stabbed multiple times and something spooked him. I think someone saw him in a parking lot, saw some activity. He rolled her out of the vehicle and ran and to get rid of the knife, dumped all her clothes out in the parking lot and took off. Well, some very smart witness and citizens took down the license number and there was a somewhat of a chase to get him. And ultimately, we had the crime scene where the body was actually she survived, went to the hospital, but didn't survive even in multiple attempts at giving her units of blood. She just bled out.

Dr. John Morgan [00:07:04] This will be important later. So she was stabbed multiple times. She was losing lots of blood. She got a large number of blood transfusions at the hospital at that time.

Robert Thompson [00:07:14] Yes.

Dr. John Morgan [00:07:14] Were they matching blood type?

Robert Thompson [00:07:16] And I'm not sure whether they even bothered. I think it was one of these emergency things or they were just.

Dr. John Morgan [00:07:21] Just hoping she hadn't gotten another transfusion.

Robert Thompson [00:07:23] They cross typed her as best they could and then did it. Yeah, I remember getting post transfusion samples that I had all kinds of ABO. So I'm assuming possibly. And this is a recollection, I'm not sure.

Dr. John Morgan [00:07:35] That's fine.

Robert Thompson [00:07:35] But what I did have to do is use tissue to get the correct ABO from the victim. We also found the knife, at the crime scene where she was stabbed in this parking lot. There was a blood trail to the where the knife was found. Also happened to a match has set at his home. The blood had a mixture of not only the victims, but also the suspects at that time.

Dr. John Morgan [00:07:58] And how did you know then?

Robert Thompson [00:08:00] Actually sampling multiple places of the handle and the blade. What happens in these type of frantic stabbings? There's no hilt or no guard on the knife. The blood gets onto the handle. It gets very, very slippery. And the suspect many times cuts themselves. And he was bleeding. And that's important because I was able to

show a mixture of her blood and his blood later on in the case. Also, the samples going to where the knife was finally found was his blood type.

Dr. John Morgan [00:08:33] So you say the same M.O.. So how much was similar across all the different murders was this?

Robert Thompson [00:08:38] Well, once we, what had happened was he was wrapped up on this homicide. We had no idea he was doing others. It was only about a month or two later when an archer up in the Molalla Forest, just outside of Portland, up in the Molalla forests, was deer hunting, and he missed a deer and he went after his shaft because they're expensive and came across some decomposing bodies. Of course, he calls the police when he found 1 or 2. Then he started looking for more and there was actually multiple bodies at differing stages. And because of the way they were comported and the clothing missing and also some other items that were at the scene, namely a small orange juice containers and also miniature vodka bottles. You could tell that it was a signature here. When we evaluated the suspect's car, his truck, after the last homicide, where we did not know there was a serial murder going on. We found some similar items in the vehicle. Also, what he did with the victim's clothing was actually take the clothing back to his shop in a stove, you know, a wood stove and burn all the clothing down. So when the investigators and myself went there a few times, finally sifted that stove. I found metal objects from more than just a single clothing, you know, overnight bag. There is multiple shoe eyelets, different bra connectors, different shanks, some shoes. And it turned out that I was able to show that the shank from a burned shoe in that stove was similar in all ways to the shank of a shoe that was left at that last homicide in the parking lot.

Dr. John Morgan [00:10:20] Okay.

Robert Thompson [00:10:21] Yeah. So I could show that something similar was burned in his stove. So that's just one of lots of evidence that started linking him not only to the last one, but as I was going through the evidence for the last homicide he committed, I thought, oh my God, this is probably related to the bodies being discovered up at Molalla forest. So independently, I was able to then they of course, by then the detectives put two and two together also. So independently, I came to the same conclusion.

Dr. John Morgan [00:10:49] The orange juice and vodka stuff and the...

Robert Thompson [00:10:51] There was there was a strap of plastic in the back of the truck, which I later tried to see if I could match that tear off strip to caps that were still a crime scene. I wasn't able to, but I was able to show there's certainly similar class characteristics.

Dr. John Morgan [00:11:08] Okay.

Robert Thompson [00:11:09] I was at the autopsy collecting the evidence. There was took almost two days to do the autopsies because we're dealing with six victims.

Dr. John Morgan [00:11:16] So that included six victims in the forest or five from the forest and one from.

Robert Thompson [00:11:20] Now six in a forest and one in the parking lot. From what I recollect, I could be off one. Its got to be so many people and he had so many of those. I

think at that time were Jane Doe's that slowly became identified over the years, the last one just by the side as I was collecting trace evidence out of the hair masses of the victims. But I carefully packaged all those hair masses and years later, I think about a year or two ago, they found the hair masses from that Jane Doe, and they did some reanalysis of the DNA using new technology and were able to find the family and then therefore identify the last victim out of all those people.

Dr. John Morgan [00:12:02] Wow.

Robert Thompson [00:12:03] It was nice to know that my care two decades ago helped identify so well.

Dr. John Morgan [00:12:08] There's a lot of really cool stories and they all go back to the idea of really, really good crime scene work and really, really good evidence collection. And that really is timeless. Right?

Robert Thompson [00:12:19] Right. Yeah. And also, you have to have so much patience. I mean, people might want to get into our field thinking everything is wrapped up in an hour with commercials. It literally took me and I hate to use the word literally, but it literally took me two years to do all the microscopic work, all the comparisons. And one of the reasons was not that I was just sitting on my hands all the time. I had also two other serial murders going on. We had other casework going on. So you're kind of like a short order cook. You're doing what you can and then you get more samples in. You do what you can. So if you're going to get into this field, you can't just do one case at a time. You have to be able to manage your casework.

Dr. John Morgan [00:13:00] Do we know the time sequence or anything of that nature?

Robert Thompson [00:13:02] He did. My recollection is he did almost all of his homicides within like three months, 2 to 3 months. So there was a cluster. So you can see he's probably ramping up, started enjoying killing people. But there were some ladies that were very lucky. They basically acquiesced and didn't fight back. And in this case, that's what he wanted. So when they weren't any fun anymore, he kicked them out. That's probably why they survived. And they were able to testify in his earlier trials.

Dr. John Morgan [00:13:33] The case in the parking lot itself was your first line to Dayton Leroy Rogers, right?

Robert Thompson [00:13:42] His car. His house.

Dr. John Morgan [00:13:44] So the car license plate led them directly to his house, I assume.

Robert Thompson [00:13:48] Small pickup truck. Yeah.

Dr. John Morgan [00:13:49] Okay. Or the pickup truck? Yeah. So you were able to match a shoe between the victim there and the stove. How big a stove was it?

Robert Thompson [00:13:58] It was just one of those. Kind of like those woodstoves you have in the house. It wasn't a really large or anything. It was just. He kept stuffing stuff in there until it burned down.

Dr. John Morgan [00:14:08] Were you able to match stuff from that stove to some of the victims in the forest?

Robert Thompson [00:14:13] I think primarily the fact that we had so many items from more than one would be objectively one person's clothing. Right? That that helped. I mean, I don't know if I was able to actually match certain objects. I was able to match some glass particles that were from a earring and a partial earring in a hair mass that was related back to a victim.

Dr. John Morgan [00:14:39] I see.

Robert Thompson [00:14:39] So there was some of that. Basically, it's difficult to find comparison type material in that type of situation where bodies have been left out and decomposing. Now, another singular thing that was part of his criminology is that he had a foot fetish and he had cut off some of the victim's feet with a hacksaw. Now, when we were in the shop, we had lots of hacksaw blades, of which he had to do the comparison. Which gave me another quandary is that how do I make proper tool marks in bone? What would be the right bone? What would be the right material? Now, I looked at the hacksaw blades that we recovered. I couldn't find any bone fragments under the microscope. So I'm back to doing the tool marks, at least to show similar class characteristics. The bones were cut through. And then it snapped. It's called a Greens six snap. So there's a trough in that snapping part to be able to give an idea of the width of the blade. But hacksaws, are hacksaws, are hacksaws. So, I mean, it's not like you didn't really narrow down the population. But I wanted to make an attempt to the tool marks anyway. So what I arrived at is actually, rather than dealing with the ethical considerations of adding tool marks to the evidence that I had, which I had that cut off parts of the bone of the victims, we were able to show that actually Ivory Soap was some of the best tool marking type of material because it's soft, it won't change the blade and it has under a microscope very good microscopic features that mimic the tool mark.

Dr. John Morgan [00:16:14] And it's very uniform because it's 99.44% pure.

Robert Thompson [00:16:19] But you can't just do the comparisons on right on those material. You have to make casts. Sure. So we do. That's typical of tool mark examinations. So I did make an attempt to get a match with other than just seeing class characteristics. But by then it was pretty apparent what kind of tool used to cut off the bone ends.

Robert Thompson [00:16:39] And were you able to match him directly to any of the victims in the forest using trace or some other mechanism?

Robert Thompson [00:16:47] Actually serology. He had cowboy boots that had a mixture of blood and was coming back to victims and not the last victim. One of the things we did was trace analysis of the hair. What his pattern was, was after he killed somebody and he usually he did a lot of the knifing inside the vehicle. Was that in the vehicle? I could find knife marks where he missed or went through the body. Also, he cleaned up as much as he could. And it's one of these interiors that a vinyl interior and vinyl floor. He literally went that we found out went to car washes with the one car washes and basically washed out his interior after every homicide he did. So here I am trying to find trace blood and I was still was able to find blood in the channels underneath the mats and on that window where it rolls down, it doesn't go all the way down. I was able to find some under there, under places that would be easy to clean, but on the opposite side, impossible to find. But we

almost dismantle the interior of that vehicle to find blood. At the same time, we're collecting hairs that still might be bound up in in the vehicle. And I was able to find hairs consistent with three of the victims to their standards and exclude him and his family and the people who were worked at a shop that had access to that.

Dr. John Morgan [00:18:12] This was a morphological.

Robert Thompson [00:18:14] Yes, it would be a side by side comparison under comparison microscopy. Clearly, that's not an identification, but I could show that I could discriminate amongst all those people.

Dr. John Morgan [00:18:25] The issue with hair microscopy, in my view, has always been the level of information. You know, what are you going to say about it? I mean, what is what does it really add up to? But what's cool about what you're saying is, is that you have three different comparisons that add up to all of it, but all there are the rest of the evidence. So they're you know, if they are consistent with these victims and not with anybody else who we know was in the car. Yes, that is powerful evidence. So you don't need to say it's that person's hair to the exclusion of all others in the world.

Robert Thompson [00:18:54] And I was careful in my testimony to that, too. It's just the evidence, even though it might not in itself be identification if you keep at it and you do lots of different types of evidence and still keep leading back to a source or scenario, then it's likely that is what happened. You can't say it absolutely was this person. Like you said, it's more weight. It gets added to all the other circumstantial evidence and physical evidence. Yes.

Dr. John Morgan [00:19:25] How did you find that there were other victims who wound up not getting murdered? Do they show up in some of the evidence that you were collecting?

Robert Thompson [00:19:32] That was just good police work? That was just the guys hitting the ground and talking to that segment of the society in that area that he selected his victims from. So that's how they started putting these all these pieces together. As we know, in forensic science, it doesn't take the place of good police work. Good interview skills. Good just intuition. I mean, intuition, I think, is a lost component or it isn't discussed enough. We talk about bias and how bias can creep into comparisons. Or we're into investigations and most often is discussed in a negative way. And there are some concerns you have to know about it. You have to realize that can be a part of your own examination. But part of that is with that knowledge is you designed tests to test against the bias, test against all the potential hypotheses and make sense. So knowing the bias and the research that's in it is very important. What I think it's lost is experience and intuition and anti bias. That's the term I would cause.

Dr. John Morgan [00:20:37] I prefer to use the word inference over intuition.

Robert Thompson [00:20:41] There you go. Inference. Intuition. Just through experience. He knows something's off. Right. You know, you can't put your finger on it yet. So where the anti-bias comes from is if everything is so clear, like the detective tells you, I have a videotape of him shooting this clerk, and this is the gun. We arrested him an hour later. This is the gun and match the bullets back to the firearm. If you are enamored and bias prone, you could probably just test for the firearm if it agrees and somewhat and just write the comparison. But if you do it by a practical, objective way of doing the comparisons, by standard protocols and also knowing that that's latent with all kinds of bias and you do

your comparison, it doesn't take long in your career. You'll find out that's the wrong gun or that's the wrong blood type or the blood type that we assumed at the hospital was typed incorrectly. And you find these things out because you don't assume ahead of time and you do your analysis. So I say that those things that happen in your career where someone is whispering in your ear or even say a AFIS match score is really high and you find out it's still an exclusion or the detective was wrong even though he thought he had the right person. And you find exclusionary material that inoculates you. You don't forget those instances that, okay, I caught it. I am so glad I did this comparison the way I did. So where I'm pointing to is those experiences where people were so sure but wrong and they have that information in your case, but you still test it properly and you find that they're wrong. That is counter, I would say to the negative bias. It's something that because you are tuned to past cases where they were so wrong or the results were incorrect and you caught it, that also as part of that experiential knowledge, that kind of combats that bias, I think.

Dr. John Morgan [00:22:51] Well, yeah, one of the things that happens, especially in a case like this, is that it's different from other people who work in the, in like science in the sense that you're encountering the world, right? And the world is full of variability that you don't, you can't necessarily anticipate at the beginning.

Robert Thompson [00:23:06] Exactly.

Dr. John Morgan [00:23:07] You know, if you're doing toxicology of a urine or blood sample or something like that, that's a little bit more predictable. Like when the blood typing started to come back from the final victim, you all must have been like, What the heck is going on here? Right? I mean, so you were seeing multiple serology types coming out of that because of the blood transfusion. So you didn't know that at first, I assume?

Robert Thompson [00:23:29] Yeah, but we're kind of that time tuned to that, though, when we start seeing those blood types all over the place, that didn't make genetic sense, then, you know, that's probably from the transfusions.

Dr. John Morgan [00:23:40] Was it all serology that you used initially in that case.

Robert Thompson [00:23:42] Yes, there was one attempt at an early DNA, but there wasn't enough time, enough DNA that was degraded at that time. The typical blood stain that would be able to get a RFLP would be about the size of a quarter. I mean, semen stain about the size of a dime. I mean, those are oceans of sample nowadays.

Dr. John Morgan [00:24:03] Yeah, that's a lot of copies of DNA.

Robert Thompson [00:24:05] For now, we're dealing with touch DNA that's invisible to the human eye. What was interesting in this case, it was it taxed you in a way as an examiner that you had to be very patient. I had thousands of hairs to go through. And a lot of population to compare to. So you can imagine how many inter comparisons that turns into. And you have to be somewhat prepared to take a lot of notes and organize yourself because it is such a massive undertaking. And the main Molalla Forest murder case, I testified, I believe, almost three days, almost three days, two for sure.

Dr. John Morgan [00:24:45] Wow.

Robert Thompson [00:24:46] Because I had so much evidence to talk about did. And that was a quick trial in comparison to some states, right?

Dr. John Morgan [00:24:52] Yeah. Did he tie up all of the victims?

Robert Thompson [00:24:55] The best we could assume. I can't remember. Somewhere in that tied up state somewhere.

Dr. John Morgan [00:24:59] Yeah. Were you ever, ever able to match things of that nature, like the rope or anything else that he used?

Robert Thompson [00:25:05] Well, there were some not comparisons. That was actually done by the FBI to see if there was anything special about the knots that were on the victim's wrists.

Dr. John Morgan [00:25:16] But you've also been called in for sentencing work. So how did that relate to the forensic science?

Robert Thompson [00:25:22] What happened was and I think it's a handful of times over the years was that there would be a change in the Supreme Court ruling on death penalties and either in the state or other states and then became federal. I'm not sure if any of them went to the Supreme Court, but there was a change in guidelines for sentencing, of which the earlier sentencing did not fulfill. So his defense team were able to successfully ask for another sentencing hearing. Now, the sentencing hearing is put together by a fresh group of jurors. And the question of guilt or innocence is not that point they have to decide, but they have to decide whether he deserves a death penalty or not or whatever sentence they come up with. So the experts in the sentencing, both sides are involved. However, the prosecutor in these cases knew that this was a fresh jury as many years now passed. They just put on at least the evidence to show, obviously, that not only is he guilty, but here's what he was doing. Right, to add to it. And you can't really pull it off just by photos. You have to see the physical evidence. And if you have the physical evidence, you need an expert to testify about it.

Dr. John Morgan [00:26:39] I mean, just the fact that you were able to find his blood on the knife, the implication of that with respect to the violence of the act is clear to, I think, to a jury.

Robert Thompson [00:26:49] Also, no matter how much he tried to clear up his vehicle or his clothes, I was able to find other victim's blood on him. Then the hairs comparisons show that there was at least those people possibly were in the interior of the vehicle. What the prosecutor did was and I don't want to belittle it, but it was a shortened version of the physical evidence that I testified to many days. Now, I could do it and maybe in about 3 or 4 hours. So it's a shortened version. We call it the Reader's Digest version of the physical evidence in that case. And that was because the jury needs to see the physical evidence, not just maybe listen to earlier testimony. Those times I came back wherever I was working and testified to in the sentencing hearing.

Dr. John Morgan [00:27:39] Okay. I don't know if I described it up front, but you are actually court accepted in, I think, 8 or 9 disciplines. Yes. And you it sounds like you used the majority of them in this case.

Robert Thompson [00:27:52] It was serology, hairs and fibers, because I did a fiber component also tool marks, crime scenes, blood spatter, because there was some spatter that was inside the windshield and vehicle where he couldn't clean it, didn't see it before he got arrested from his last victim. Autopsy, collections, photography, technical photography, all those things. And that was not uncommon for a lot of us to have those type of cases that were interdisciplinary whether we were doing it or we had a couple of cohorts in our lab doing the other specialties. What made this big was just the amount of physical evidence and the time it took to do all the examinations.

Dr. John Morgan [00:28:33] And it seems like oftentimes, like the trace evidence, folks feel like, well, we're forgotten almost these days as a profession. I hope that that never happens because we really do need in cases like this and across the board to be able to pull in sometimes unpredictable kinds of evidence.

Robert Thompson [00:28:51] I agree. Absolutely. While the source determinations in many cases are the thing that DNA is able to extract out and be able to point to people and exclude others. What's important with trace is it tells the circumstance. It's the context. It helps people understand where people were and weren't, what contact there was and wasn't. And there's a lot more historical reconstruction value in trace that shouldn't be lost. You can nail down a source, but that source might have a reasonable alibi that would argue why you found that DNA where you did. But he or she might have a harder time explaining why they have the carpet fibers of the trunk on the body. That's not DNA, right? Why is there fragments of glass in a pocket of a guy doing a burglary when you can compare that back?

Dr. John Morgan [00:29:49] Sure.

Robert Thompson [00:29:49] I mean, there's things that are out there that are not DNA. I know it's attractive because it is getting the ultimate evidence against the person on source if you have that comparison. But if you're going to be a full service laboratory, I'm going to have to argue that you should have a very strong trace component, or at least have the ability to send it somewhere.

Dr. John Morgan [00:30:11] That's part of the story. I mean, we were just talking here, we've done a podcast with looking at the research that shows, you know, juries like they trust the story. I mean, they have a story in their minds and they're looking to see whether the evidence fits that.

Robert Thompson [00:30:24] Exactly.

Dr. John Morgan [00:30:25] And so that goes way beyond DNA. It really does.

Robert Thompson [00:30:29] And that is part of the work that a good defense attorney will do. Some of the best defense attorneys have a story.

Dr. John Morgan [00:30:37] Yeah.

Robert Thompson [00:30:38] And they have a story that fits the evidence usually. And it depends on whether the jury believes a story or not. So if they have a story and the other side doesn't, then I think they're shortchanging themselves.

Dr. John Morgan [00:30:53] Well an amazing set of forensic science investigations that literally and truly, literally took you two years to do. Thank you, Robert, for being on Just Science.

Robert Thompson [00:31:03] Thank you very much.

Outro [00:31:07] Next week, Just Science interviews Erin Sims about a case study involving a methamphetamine fueled crime spree and double homicide. Opinions or points of views expressed in this podcast represent a consensus of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of its funding.