THE SOERING CASE MADE SIMPLE!
The Soering Case Made Simple!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. The Confession
3. The DNA
4. The Sockprint
5. The F.B.I. Profile
6. The Girlfriend
7. The Shoeprint
8. Conclusion
On March 30, 1985, someone murdered Derek and Nancy Haysom, a wealthy middle-aged couple living just outside Lynchburg in Bedford County, Virginia. The crime was so brutal that some newspapers compared it to the Manson slayings.

My name is Jens Soering, and I have spent more than thirty-two years in prison for killing the Haysoms. The problem is, I didn't do it. For decades, only very few people believed my claim of innocence. That finally changed in 2016, when DNA tests showed that the blood at the crime scene, which was once believed to be mine, was in fact left by SOMEONE ELSE.

In "The Soering Case Made Simple!" I have laid out all the evidence, including photographs, legal documents, and forensic reports. I'm not asking you to believe me! But I do ask you to consider the facts.
This is Ricky Gardner, the Bedford County investigator who took my confession on June 8, 1986.

Did I tell him the truth? Or did I give him a false confession?
According to Prof. Gisli H. Gudjonsson (King’s College London), "false confessions are most commonly made as a way of protecting someone else and this is a phenomenon that is particularly likely to occur in adolescence."


On June 8, 1986, at the age of 19, I took the rap for my girlfriend Elizabeth Haysom in order to save her life -- to protect her from execution in the electric chair. Because my father was a German diplomat, I thought I had diplomatic immunity.

Turns out I was wrong about that.
Apart from the victims' footprints, there were also:

- **sock prints in blood.** *(items LR3 and LR5)*
- **a sneaker print in blood.** *(item LR2)*
- **boot prints in blood.** *(Com. Ex. 269 and 270)*

In addition to the male victim's type A and the female victim's type AB blood, there was also:

- **type B in the kitchen.** *(item 38K)*
- **type O on the front door and in the bedroom.** *(items 1B, 2FE, 4FE, 5FE and 6FE)*
- **male type AB in both places.** *(items 23K#1 and 7FE#1)*
EPISODE 1: THE CONFESSION

WHY MY CONFESSION COULDN’T POSSIBLY BE TRUE – REASON 2

The location of the victims’ bodies required at least TWO killers. The attack had clearly begun in the dining room and then spread into two opposite directions:

- to the kitchen, on one side of the dining room, where the female victim was found.
- to the living room, on the other side of the dining room, where the male victim was found.

One attacker could not have been in both places at the same time. Nor could a single attacker have killed one victim after the other. Both the kitchen and the living room had doors leading to the outside, so either the male or the female victim could have run to the neighbors for help.
EPISODE 1: THE CONFESSION

ONE ATTACKER COULD NOT BE IN TWO ROOMS AT THE SAME TIME.
The story I told Investigator Gardner contained a number of mistakes that the real killer would not have made:

- I said the female victim wore jeans. **WRONG!**
  She wore a flowery evening robe with pajamas.

- I said the male victim was in the dining room. **WRONG!**
  He was in the living room.

- I said that, at the dining room table, I sat to the male victim's right. **WRONG!**
  The only other place setting was to his left.
• I said that I cut the victims' throats but didn't mention a single stab wound.
  WRONG!
  There were approximately 38 stab wounds.

• I never mentioned taking a shower to wash off blood.
  WRONG!
  Someone clearly DID take a shower after the crime (item 13B).

• I said that Elizabeth was in Washington when the crime took place.
  WRONG!
  Outside the front and rear doors, police found three Merit cigarette butts, Elizabeth's favorite brand (items 1FE and 1R).
  Near the female victim was a damp rag with a drop of type B blood, Elizabeth's type (item 38K).
  Near the other victim was a vodka bottle with Elizabeth's fingerprints. (item 17LR).
One year PRIOR to my arrest, F.B.I. Special Agent Ed Sulzbach produced a suspect profile that pointed to Elizabeth Haysom as the killer.

Prosecutor Jim Updike referred to this profile in a letter written on June 18, 1985: "Moreover, Special Agent Edward F. Sulzbach of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is trained in the field of compiling profiles of criminal suspects, viewed the scene and the evidence gathered during this investigation and stated that the suspect was female and knew the victims."

Investigator Gardner knew all this when I gave him my "confession." And yet he never wondered if I might be lying to him? Huh?
On June 7, 1986 – just one day before I gave Investigator Gardner my confession of June 8 – I gave him and another police officer, Kenneth Beever, a statement that was tape-recorded:

"Would you consider, under the circumstances, taking into account your answer, pleading guilty to something you didn't do?"

"I can't say for sure right now, but I can see, I can see it happening, yes. I think it is a possibility. I think it happens in real life."

"I disagree with you, but don't let's get into any legal arguments now. I'm sorry. I think you answered my question."

"I mean, you know. I couldn't answer that question right now. I certainly hope that, I hope very much that it's not going to come to something like that."
But the very next day, it **DID** come to something like that:

I gave Mr. Gardner a false confession.

**Why?**

Because I was terrified that Virginia would execute my girlfriend Elizabeth Haysom in "ol' sparky", the electric chair.
EPISODE 1: THE CONFESSION
WHY MY CONFESSION COULDN'T POSSIBLY BE TRUE – REASON 6

There is not a single solitary piece of forensic evidence that corroborates my confession.

- None of the fingerprints at the crime scene are mine. (Fingerprint report, February 13, 1990.)
- Sneaker print LR2 was left by "a woman or a small man or boy." (Deputy C.L. Baker's report, April 8, 1985.)
- Sock print LR3 was left by someone whose foot corresponded to "a man's size 5 or 6 shoe," whereas I wear a size 8 ½ to 9. (Footprint report, June 7, 1985.)
- I was excluded as a possible source of the human hair found in the blood-stained bathroom sink. (Hair report, February 8, 1990.)
- While I do have type O blood, DNA tests in 2009 revealed that the type O blood at the scene was left by someone else – someone with a different genetic profile. (DNA report, September 22, 2009.)

THERE IS NO TRACE OF MY PRESENCE AT THE CRIME BECAUSE I WAS NOT THERE.
Five days after I gave Investigator Gardner my confession, Bedford County prosecutor Jim Updike indicted me for capital murder, which carried the death penalty. So my parents hired English, German and American attorneys to attempt to save my life.

The lawyers came up with a plan: to have me put on trial IN GERMANY for the murders that had happened IN AMERICA. But to make that happen, I had to be extradited from England to Germany. That was not so easy: Extradition requests require SOME evidence to show that the prisoner had actually committed a crime.

The problem was that the German government had no evidence. My confession to Investigator Gardner had been given to an AMERICAN police officer. The American government refused to provide this confession to the German government, because America had filed his own extradition request for me.

So my lawyers arranged for me to "confess" all over again to a German prosecutor, in order to provide enough evidence to satisfy the requirements of a German extradition request. The ONLY reason for providing this "confession" was to try to get to Germany, to avoid being executed in America.

In December 1986, I "confessed" AGAIN – because I didn’t want to be executed.

Obviously, this plan did not succeed. The British court denied the German extradition request and, instead, granted the American extradition request.

As part of the habeas corpus proceedings as well as the pardon petition, my German lawyers provided written statements explaining that I provided the December 1986 "confession" only on their legal advice.
In 2016, my pardon attorney Steven D. Rosenfield brought Dr. Andrew T. Griffiths into the case. Dr. Griffiths reached the rank of Detective Superintendent, Head of Intelligence and Crime, in the Sussex, U.K., police before retiring, obtaining his Ph.D., and becoming one of the leading international consultants and trainers in advanced police interrogation techniques.

Dr. Griffiths spent five months reviewing many thousands of pages relating to my four-day interrogation of June 5 to 8, 1986. On July 29, 2016, he submitted a 21-page report concluding, "[I]n the case of Jens Soering there are significant doubts about the reliability of the confession he made, so as to render it unreliable when considered against other case information and the circumstances of his interrogation." (Report, page 19)
In particular, Dr. Griffiths faulted the police for denying me access to my attorney throughout the four days that I was questioned: "The fact that legal protocols appear to have been breached meant that Soering did not receive the appropriate legal advice ... It is clear that there was no legitimate reason why Soering was held incommunicado." (Report, page 18)

While there was no physical coercion, Dr. Griffiths noted that "it is obvious from the first interrogation that [Investigator Ricky] Gardner believes Soering to be guilty of the crimes. This is significant and contrary to modern day best practice in relation to interrogating suspects. ... In effect, nothing of what Soering said was probed or challenged in a manner that demonstrated an investigative mind-set ... Rather, his brief confession was accepted as complete evidence of guilt and an opportunity to close the case." (Report, pages 11 and 12)
Finally, Dr. Griffiths noted that "it is significant that Soering’s admission is incorrect on key details and omits other important detail. In particular the injuries inflicted and the clothing of Mrs. Haysom. Gardner’s interrogation was not skilled and was confirmatory in its approach. ... Soering was a naive, love-struck teenager who was volunteering information. The situation required an objective and enquiring mind to sift the generality of his story ..." (Report, page 18)

Please note that Dr. Griffiths finalized his report on July 29, 2016. He was unaware that, just a few days earlier, I had discovered DNA and serology evidence that finally allowed me to prove my innocence. This evidence is laid out for you in Episode 2: The DNA.
EPISODE 2: THE DNA
This is Mary Jane Burton, the forensic scientist who, in 1985, preserved the blood samples that allowed me to prove my innocence in 2016.

Why did her colleagues at the Department of Forensic Science begin attacking her test results in the fall of 2016?
Because the Commonwealth of Virginia is very reluctant to admit that it has locked up the wrong man for thirty-two years. So instead of accepting Mary Jane Burton's forensic work, the state is now attacking her test results.

If she was wrong, then I'm not innocent, and Virginia's reputation remains intact!
On August 12, 1985, serologist Mary Jane Burton issued a twelve-page report, detailing the results of dozens of ABO blood typing tests she had performed.

**Ms. Burton found four different blood types at the crime scene:**

- Derek Haysom's type A,
- Nancy Haysom's type AB,
- one drop of type B, and
- five drops of type O.
On June 13, 1990, Mary Jane Burton testified at my trial that she had found five drops of type O blood at the crime scene, and that I had type O blood. This was key to the prosecution's case that I was the killer. *(Trial transcript, June 13, 1990, pages 16-18)*
To emphasize the importance of this blood typing evidence, another serologist, Elmer Gist, Jr., was also called to testify. He confirmed Ms. Burton's findings regarding the type O blood. *(Trial transcript, June 13, 1990, page 42.)*
Prosecutor Jim Updike hammered home the ABO blood typing test results in his closing arguments to the jury: "You have got type O blood there, his type, his type." Just in case any jury member didn't catch that, Mr. Updike mentioned the type O blood approx. TWENTY TIMES MORE. This was, after all, the only solid forensic evidence that he had. (Trial transcript, June 21, 1990, page 82. See also pages 83-85, 92 and 208-216.)

In a newspaper interview directly after the trial, juror W. Shelton Adams said that "physical evidence at the murder site, including blood and a sock print, pointed to Soering as the killer."

(University Journal, XII, No. 91, 1990.)
EPISODE 2: THE DNA

LET'S TIME TRAVEL FORWARD NINETEEN YEARS, FROM 1990 TO 2009.

On September 22 of that year, Shelley Edler of the Department of Forensic Science (D.F.S.) issued a report, giving the DNA test results for eleven blood samples from the 1985 Haysom murders. Her results were a big surprise: I was positively excluded as a possible source of any of the blood tested.

But that didn't prove my innocence, according to Ms. Edler. In her report, she wrote that a group of eight blood samples were "consistent with having originated with a common male contributor."

Ms Edler suggested that this "common male contributor" was the male victim, even though she admitted that she did not have "a known DNA profile for W.R. Derek Haysom".

I had no reason to question Ms. Edler's conclusion at the time.
In the spring of that year, I asked a friend to send me Mary Jane Burton's twelve-page report of August 12, 1985.

I had not seen this document since my trial in 1990, twenty-six years earlier.

On July 26, 2016, I cross-referenced Ms. Burton's ABO blood testing results from 1985 with Ms. Edler's DNA testing results from 2009.

And I discovered that Ms. Edler was wrong.
### EPISODE 2: THE DNA

#### THE CERTIFICATES OF ANALYSIS

**Excerpt from pages 10 and 11 of the Bureau of Forensic Science’s Certificate of Analysis dated August 12, 1985**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>BLOOD DETECTED</th>
<th>BLOOD TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6FE Stain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt from page 3 of the Department of Forensic Science’s Certificate of Analysis dated September 24, 2009**

- Item 22DR – Stain
- Item 2FE – Stain
- Item 3SK – Swabs
- Item 4DR – Stain
- Item 6FE – Stain
- Item 6LR – Dried stain at W.R. Derek Hayson
- Item 7DR – Napkin
- Item 8DR – Seat

- DNA profiles consistent with having originated from a common male contributor were developed.
  - Jens Sorning and Elizabeth Hayson are eliminated as contributors.
  - Without a known DNA profile from W.R. Derek Hayson or Nancy Hayson, no conclusions can be reached as to whether these DNA profiles may be attributable to either of them.
The group of eight blood samples in the 2009 Certificate of Analysis were NOT "consistent with having originated with a common male contributor" at all. According to Ms. Burton's ABO blood typing tests:

- six of the samples were type A, Derek Haysom's type, and
- two of the samples were type O.

So those eight blood samples should not have been grouped together at all. Some of the blood had been left by one person (type A), and some of it had been left by another person (type O).

And the DNA tests proved that I could not have been the source of the two samples of type O blood.

So now, at last, I was able to prove my innocence:

The type O blood that prosecutor Updike had told the jury was mine had a different genetic profile than mine.

Someone ELSE with type O had left that blood at the crime scene.
Further cross-referencing of the two forensic reports from 1985 and 2009 brought to light another surprise: Two samples of AB blood that were thought to belong to Nancy Haysom were, in reality, left by a man with type AB. This finding, too, could not have been known by looking at each forensic report in isolation; only cross-referencing the two documents could reveal these facts.

What all of this meant was that **TWO unknown men left their blood at the crime scene:**

- a man with **type O**, and
- another man with **type AB**.

And DNA proved that I could not have been either one of these men.

On August 22, 2016, my lawyer Steven D. Rosenfield filed a pardon petition that included, among several other pieces of new evidence, the new ABO blood and DNA findings.
At first, the Department of Forensic Science (D.F.S.) took a positive approach to these revelations. In two phone calls with my lawyer in early September 2016, D.F.S. supervisor Lisa Schiermeier-Wood confirmed that there was no reason to question the test results from 1985, and there was no indication of mixing of blood types.

(Memorandum for Record, undated)

- When asked about the possibility of multiple contributors to a stain, I stated that the DNA results didn’t indicate more than one contributor being detected in 6FE.
- I explained that the reason we no longer conduct ABO testing is because DNA testing is much more sensitive and discriminating.

(Memorandum for Record, September 6, 2016.)

- The Item 6FE bench notes support the conclusion of ABO type O.
- Typically the bench notes would have been recorded at the time each test (tube) was “read” for clumping or the absence of clumping.
EPISODE 2: THE DNA

THE DEPARTMENT OF FORENSIC SCIENCE (CONT.)

But then ... attitudes at the D.F.S. changed.

By the end of October, Ms. Schiermeier-Wood and Ms. Edler were telling my lawyer in a conference call that "we cannot rule out" that there might have been "a mixture," and that the blood typing test results had not been confirmed "due to sample size."

(Memorandum for Record, October 27, 2016.)

In another conference call in February of the following year, Ms. Schiermeier-Wood and Ms. Edler raised concerns with the governor's pardon investigator about "the amount of sample needed" and "whether or not the ... results could be the result of a mixture."

(Memorandum of Record, February 24, 2017.)
In none of these Memoranda for Record did Ms. Schiermeier-Wood and Ms. Edler cite any concrete facts -- any indicators in the actual test results themselves -- to justify the doubts they were now raising. They always spoke of hazy possibilities, of might-have-beens.

In other words, this was all pure speculation.
What was the purpose of this speculation?

To suggest that the type O blood wasn't REALLY type O, and the male type AB blood wasn't REALLY male type AB.
Please reflect on the irony of all this....

From the time the ABO blood typing tests were performed in 1985 until the summer of 2016, the Department of Forensic Science (D.F.S.) did not raise a single doubt about the accuracy of the test results -- because for all of those thirty-one years, those test results suggested that I was guilty.

It was only in the fall of 2016, when the cross-referencing of the various test results proved my innocence, that the D.F.S. suddenly began having second thoughts!

So for the D.F.S., test results are completely reliable when they indicate the "bad guy's" guilt. But when the test results show that the "bad guy" didn't do it, THEN one has to consider sample size and mixtures as possible reasons to disregard the test results.
When my attorney saw which way the wind was blowing, he brought two of the most prominent DNA scientists in the United States into the case:

They both reviewed all the reports and other documentation and concluded, beyond any doubt:

- There WAS blood from a type O man and a type AB man at the crime scene -- and neither one of them could have been me.
- There WAS sufficient sample size, and there was NO mixing of blood or other genetic material.
Both Dr. Schanfield and Dr. McClintock felt so strongly about these findings that they presented them at televised press conferences in the fall of 2017.

Their written reports, as well as video recordings of the press conferences, are available on my website www.jenssoering.com

On March 7, 2018, local TV reported that Dr. McClintock was planning to start his own Innocence Project at Liberty University, based on his work on my case. To me, this new Innocence Project is a kind of redemption: Virginia took 32 years of my life (so far, still counting...), but at least Liberty University will now be working to help others in my situation.
Just for our own intellectual amusement, let us assume for a moment that Mary Jane Burton, Professor Moses Schanfield and Professor J. Thomas McClintock are all idiots.

Let us assume that, indeed, the blood samples were mixtures and the sample sizes were too small, so the 1985 test results were plain wrong. That means there was NO type O blood at the crime scene at all.

But the jury based its verdict on the fact that there WAS type O blood at the scene! Remember, this was the ONLY solid forensic corroboration of my confession.

If indeed there was no type O blood at the scene, then Mary Jane Burton, Elmer Gist, Jr. and Jim Updike misled the jury about a KEY piece of evidence. Presumably they did so unintentionally -- but that doesn't change the fact that the jury's verdict was based on false information.
A verdict that is based on such an enormous mistake cannot be allowed to stand. If there was no type O blood at the scene, then I should be granted a conditional pardon, at least.
THE SOERING CASE MADE SIMPLE!

EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT
EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT

ITEM LR3

This is a bloody sockprint (item LR3) found at the crime scene. Today, everyone laughs at the idea that THIS could be used as evidence in a criminal trial. But according to jury member Jake Bibb, he would not have found me guilty, but for sock print LR3. (University Journal, XII, No. 91, 1990)

Is it really fair to keep me in prison on such flimsy "evidence?"
EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT

LET'S TIME-TRAVEL BACK TO 1985, THE YEAR DEREK AND NANCY HAYSOM WERE MURDERED.

On June 7 of that year, the state forensic lab's impressions analyst Rick Johnson issued a report, stating that sock print LR3 "corresponds to a size 6 1/2 to 7 1/2 woman's shoe or a size 5 to 6 man's shoe."

Mr. Johnson could not be more specific because the sock print was so smeared. Also, because the foot making the print was covered by a sock, the print contained no dermal ridges, like the whorls of a fingerprint, that could be used for identification.

It is important to note that, at the time Rick Johnson issued his report in the summer of 1985, I was not yet a suspect in this case. So his analysis of LR3 is "blind," i.e. truly neutral and objective.
EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT

LET'S TIME-TRAVEL FROM 1985 TO 1990,
THE YEAR I WAS EXTRADITED FROM ENGLAND TO AMERICA TO STAND TRIAL IN VIRGINIA.

Shortly after my arrival, Bedford County detectives discovered that I had a size 8 1/2 foot. There was a half-inch difference between my foot and the sockprint, which Mr. Johnson had determined to be size 5 to 6.

You would think that this would lead the detectives and the prosecutor to re-think their theory of the crime, that I had committed the murders and left LR3 at the scene.

WRONG.

They decided simply to ignore Rick Johnson's report. He was not called as a witness at my trial, and his June 7, 1985, report was not introduced into evidence.
Instead of using Rick Johnson from the state forensic lab, prosecutor Jim Updike found another examiner: Robert Hallett. He was willing to tell the jury that the bloody sock print WAS left by me, **DESPITE** the half-inch difference in length.

Mr. Hallett had no professional qualifications as a footprint examiner; his forensic specialty was tire impressions. As a result, Judge William Sweeney refused to grant him "expert witness" status and forbade him from giving the jury his opinion.

**THE COURT:** Before you start, Mr. Hallett, I want you to state facts and not opinions, sir, you understand?

*(Trial transcript June 13, 1990, page 129.)*
Unfortunately, the judge then allowed Mr. Hallett to testify as if he were an expert, using technical-sounding terminology and drawing red arrows on the sock print and my sample footprint. Mr. Hallett told the jury that the half-inch difference in length between LR3 and my footprint could be explained by a "double impression at the heel." (Trial transcript, June 7, 1990, pages 130-132.)

Also, Mr. Hallett showed the jury an overlay of my sample bare footprint over sock print LR3. Below are the two prints side by side.
In addition, Mr. Hallett showed the jury an overlay of one of Elizabeth Haysom's sample footprints over LR3. Her footprint looked very different from the sock print. The suggestion was that, of the two of us, I was the one who left LR3.

In his closing arguments, prosecutor Jim Updike told the jury that the sock print "matches and fits like a glove."
*(Trial transcript, June 21, 1990, page 92, see also 87.)*

This was years before the O. J. Simpson trial.

In a newspaper interview directly after the verdict, juror Jake Bibb said that the jury had been split six-six when deliberations began. Ultimately, it was LR3 that convinced him and his colleagues of my guilt: "What he wrote didn't convict him [and] what people said didn't convict him. ... If it had not been for that [sock] print, I would have found him innocent." *(The University Journal, Vol. XII, No. 91)*
After the trial, my defense lawyer Rick Neaton finally decided to compare LR3 to all the OTHER sample footprints provided by Elizabeth Haysom.

Mr. Neaton discovered that the VERY FIRST sample footprint of hers resembled the sock print as strongly as did my sample footprint. Above are the three prints side-by-side: LR3, mine, and Elizabeth’s.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Hallett saw the footprint on the right -- again, it was the VERY FIRST in the series of prints Elizabeth provided. So Mr. Hallett deliberately chose a DIFFERENT print of hers in order to make the jury believe that she could not have left the sock print.
EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT

LET'S TIME-TRAVEL FROM 1990 TO 1995, THE YEAR I GOT A NEW ATTORNEY FOR THE HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS: GAIL STARLING MARSHALL.

She obtained analyses of sock print LR3 from two fully qualified experts. One, from the F.B.I. Crime Lab, found that Mr. Hallett's testimony at my trial had been "quite misleading" because LR3 could equally well have been left by me, Elizabeth Haysom, one of her half-brothers (!) or "any other individual with a print of the same approximate length."

(Frederick Webb, November 27, 1996.)
The other expert, from the New Jersey Bureau of Criminal Identification, found Mr. Hallett’s testimony to have been "very misleading" because the "Soering print is long[er] than the crime scene print. ... [T]he crime scene print matches in size only with Ms. Haysom's print."

(Russell Johnson, April 14, 1995.)
Let’s time-travel from 1995 to 2009, the year the Virginia Law Review published a landmark study by Brandon Garrett and Peter Neufeld entitled “Invalid Forensic Science Testimony and Wrongful Convictions.”

On pages 71-72 of that study, the authors discuss how Robert Hallett’s misleading testimony about a shoeprint led to the wrongful conviction of Charles Fain in Idaho.
A study of the transcript of Mr. Fain's trial reveals astonishing parallels to my case. In Mr. Fain's trial:

- Mr. Hallett used an overlay (page 295) with red arrows (page 296) -- just as in my trial.
- There was a half-inch difference in length between the two prints (page 310) -- just as in my trial.
- Mr. Hallett explained away this difference in length with his famous "double impression" (pages 295 and 309) -- just as in my trial.

Mr. Fain was exonerated through DNA after "only" sixteen years in prison. **I am still waiting, twenty-eight years after my trial (and thirty-two years after my arrest).**
EPISODE 3: THE SOCKPRINT

LET'S TIME TRAVEL FROM 2009 TO 2011, THE YEAR THE GERMAN TV NETWORK ZDF BROADCAST A SEGMENT ABOUT MY CASE ON ITS NEWS MAGAZINE PROGRAM "ZDFZOOM."

This program included an interview with Major Ricky Gardner, the Bedford County detective who claims credit for my conviction. The ZDF reporter Ulf Roeller showed Mr. Gardner a video recording of my habeas corpus attorney Gail Starling Marshall discussing the sock print LR3:
"Any reputable forensic analyst will tell you that this is hogwash."

"She is absolutely right. She is. But nobody ever said that was Jens Soering's footprint. Did you hear me say that? I didn’t say that. I kept saying that was similar. Another piece of the puzzle."

To watch this video, please visit www.jenssoering.com/tvreports and choose video clip no. 12
THE SOERING CASE MADE SIMPLE!

EPISODE 4: THE F.B.I. PROFILE
This is F.B.I. Special Agent Ed Sulzbach, one of the first agents to be trained in the then-new art of "profiling" suspects. His skills in this field became so well-known that the novelist Patricia Cornwell based one of her recurring characters on him. Shortly after the discovery of the Haysom murders in 1985, Bedford County Sheriff Carl Wells brought Special Agent Sulzbach into the case in order to develop a suspect profile.
(Source: Roanoke Times & World News, April 14, 1985; F.B.I. file)

Why did Bedford County authorities then decide to suppress this profile for nearly thirty years?
In a letter dated June 18, 1985, Bedford County Prosecutor Jim Updike wrote, "Moreover, Special Agent Edward F. Sulzbach of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is trained in the field of compiling profiles of criminal suspects, viewed the scene and the evidence gathered during this investigation and stated that the suspect was female and knew the victims."

In the documentary film "Killing for Love," Special Agent Sulzbach went even further, saying, "I settled on the daughter," Elizabeth Haysom.
The Supreme Court of the U.S. made it clear that a prosecutor must "make timely disclosure to the defense of all evidence OR INFORMATION known to the prosecutor that tends to negate the guilt of the accused or mitigates the offense."

(Source: Mercer v Commonwealth, citing Kyles v Whitley)

The suspect profile was not, technically, court-admissible evidence — but it certainly WAS information. So Mr. Updike had an obligation to inform my defense lawyer. But he did not do so.
EPISODE 4: THE F.B.I. PROFILE

DISCOVERY OF THE PROFILE'S EXISTENCE

My team did not hear of the profile's existence until 2012. That's when retired Master Detective David Watson was hired by my parole attorney Gail Ball to re-investigate the case.

In the course of his work, Mr. Watson discovered that the F.B.I. had performed a suspect profile. He included its primary conclusion in his report to the parole board, dated September 10, 2012.*

(*You can read Mr. Watson's entire report in the “Parole” section of my website www.jenssoering.com)
In 2013, two German filmmakers Marcus Vetter and Karin Steinberger, began making "Killing for Love," which features an interview with Special Agent Sulzbach himself.

Mr. Sulzbach explains on camera how he reached his conclusions. And he specifically points to Elizabeth Haysom as the person who fits his profile the best.

Sadly, Ed Sulzbach died not long after this interview was filmed.
"Killing for Love" also contains a scene in which the original senior investigator on the Haysom murders, Chuck Reid, takes a telephone call from Ricky Gardner, the detective who replaced Mr. Reid and now claims credit for my conviction.
Chuck, we never did an F.B.I. profile.

Yeah, we did.

No, we didn't.

It was Ed Sulzbach. See, that's how I got to know Ed.
Now they [the filmmakers] are trying to make a big deal. And I told them, I said "Chuck misspoke, we never did..." Chuck, if we'd have done one of those [profiles], THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE.

To be honest with you, I have a copy of some old field reports.

But obviously there was nothing mentioned in there....

The profile? Yeah, it's in there. It's stating that Special Agent Ed Sulzbach did this psychological profile and came back to a female acquaintance.
Please note that Ricky Gardner himself says,

"[T]hat would have been exculpatory evidence."

He KNOWS the profile should have been turned over to the defense before my trial in 1990.

THAT'S why he continues to deny that the profile ever existed.
If there were any remaining doubts about the existence of the F.B.I. profile, they were removed at a press conference held on April 9, 2018.

Retired F.B.I. Special Agent Stanley J. Lapekas presented the actual F.B.I. file on the Haysom murders, which he had obtained through a F.O.I.A. request.

The file included documents proving...
that Bedford County Sheriff Carl Wells had been the one who had asked the F.B.I. to produce the profile.
... that the profile was produced at F.B.I. headquarters at Quantico, i.e. at the Behavioral Analysis Unit itself – featured in the popular TV show "Criminal Minds."
You would think that an OBVIOUS case of suppressed exculpatory evidence, like the F.B.I. profile, would quickly and easily win me a new trial, right?

In 1996, U.S. President Bill Clinton proudly signed a bill called A.E.D.P.A. This law limits prisoners to just ONE habeas corpus proceeding – the kind of constitutional appeal that deals with issues like suppressed evidence.

My habeas corpus proceeding took place from 1995 to 2001. That was my ONE shot, thanks to the A.E.D.P.A.

Of course, David Watson didn't discover the existence of the F.B.I. profile until 2012, so there was no way for me to introduce this issue in the years 1995 to 2001.

But the A.E.D.P.A. doesn't care about that. The rules are the rules! And if following the rules means that an innocent man has to stay in prison, then that's just collateral damage in the war on crime.
THE SOERING CASE MADE SIMPLE!

EPISODE 5: THE GIRLFRIEND
This is Elizabeth Roxanne Haysom in 1987, at her sentencing hearing. Prosecutor Updike allowed her to plead guilty as an accessory before the fact WITHOUT being physically present at the crime scene or participating in the murders of her parents.

Why on earth did Mr. Updike agree to this plea, when all the evidence showed that she was the actual killer?
EPISODE 5: THE GIRLFRIEND

AT THE TIME OF ELIZABETH'S SENTENCING, PROSECUTOR UPDIKE HAD THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE AGAINST HER:

SHOE PRINT

A bloody shoeprint at the scene was determined to have been left by "a woman or a small man or boy."

(Item LR2, Deputy C.L. Baker's report, April 8, 1985.)

SOCK PRINT

A bloody sockprint at the scene was determined to have been equivalent to "a size 6 1/2 to 7 1/2 woman's shoe or a size 5 to 6 man's shoe." That was Elizabeth's size; I was size 8 1/2.

(Item LR3, footprint report, June 7, 1985.)

FINGERPRINTS

Elizabeth's fingerprints were found on a vodka bottle near her father, whose blood alcohol content was 0.22.

(Item 17LR, fingerprint report, July 2, 1985.)
AT THE TIME OF ELIZABETH’S SENTENCING, PROSECUTOR UPDIKE HAD THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE AGAINST HER:

**CONFESSION**

Elizabeth had confessed to killing her parents: "I did it myself. ... I got off on it."

*(Tape-recorded statement to police, June 8, 1986.)*

**BLOOD**

Her relatively rare blood type B was found on a damp rag near her mother’s body.

*(Item 38K, serology report, August 12, 1985.)*

**TESTIMONIES**

At the sentencing hearing, Elizabeth’s half brother Dr. Howard Haysom and her mother’s best friend Annie Massie both testified that they believed Elizabeth was at the crime scene.

*(Transcript, October 6, 1987, pages 440, 441, 445 and 469.)*
EPISODE 5: THE GIRLFRIEND

At the time of Elizabeth’s sentencing, Prosecutor Updike had the following evidence against her:

**REGULAR LIAR**

At her sentencing hearing, Elizabeth repeatedly admitted, "I deceived people, I lied to them, I exaggerated it, I played roles, I acted out roles."

*(Transcript, October 6, 1987, page 293; see also 120, 283, 289.)*

**MENTAL ILLNESS**

At the same hearing, court appointed psychiatrist Dr. Robert Showalter testified that Elizabeth had an unusually severe case of borderline personality disorder.

*(Transcript, October 6, 1987, pages 367 and 371.)*

**DRUG ADDICT**

Elizabeth testified at her sentencing hearing that she was a serious drug addict and had consumed many different kinds of drugs on the day of the murders.

*(Transcript, October 5, 1987, page 167.)*
EPISODE 5: THE GIRLFRIEND

AT THE TIME OF ELIZABETH’S SENTENCING, PROSECUTOR UPDIKE HAD THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE AGAINST HER:

**MOTIVE**

Elizabeth gave conflicting testimony about her motive: At times, she alleged that her mother had sexually abused her with her father’s approval.

**MOTIVE CONT.**

Investigator Ricky Gardner, Dr. Robert Showalter and Annie Massie all testified that they had seen nude photographs of Elizabeth that her mother had taken.

**MOTIVE SOURCES**

(Transcript, October 6, 1987, pages 229-234.)

EPISODE 5: THE GIRLFRIEND

THE DEAL

Despite all of this evidence, prosecutor Jim Updike allowed Elizabeth to plead guilty to being only an accessory who had NOT been physically present when the crime occurred.

Anyone who has watched a few episodes of "Law and Order" knows why:
Mr. Updike needed Elizabeth to testify against me at my trial, so he cut her a sweetheart deal.
In 1990, Elizabeth kept her side of the bargain by taking the stand against me at my trial. And five years later, at Elizabeth's first parole hearing, Mr. Updike kept his side of the bargain.

According to a newspaper report, "Updike said [Elizabeth] Haysom helped him gather evidence against Soering and even outlined the whole case for him. ... '[S]he was of great assistance to me. She's a fascinating person to talk to. Very charming.'"

( Carlos Santos, "Parole Board denies Haysom early release," Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 24, 1995.)
Despite prosecutor Jim Updike's intervention at Elizabeth's parole hearing, she was not released. But this was not his fault!

That year, 1995, happened to be the year that Virginia's new Governor George Allen kept his campaign promise to abolish parole for all defendants convicted after January 1, 1996.
This change in the law did not affect Elizabeth directly.

She had been convicted before Governor Allen's law went into effect, so she still got her parole hearing. But obviously it was politically impossible for the parole board to release a high-profile prisoner like Elizabeth Haysom when their boss, the Governor, had made it clear that he was against parole in any form.
THE SOERING CASE MADE SIMPLE!

EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT
This is shoeprint LR2. Five days after the crime was discovered in 1985, Deputy C.L. Baker filed a report stating that it was left by "a woman or a small man or boy." And then ... everyone forgot about LR2. At my trial in 1990, LR2 was barely mentioned.

What happened in 2018 that turned shoeprint LR2 into one of the most important pieces of evidence in this case?
This is retired Charlottesville Police Department Detective Sergeant Richard L. Hudson, Jr. In 2017 and 2018, he and Albemarle County Sheriff J.E. "Chip" Harding re-investigated the Haysom murders at the request of my attorney Steven D. Rosenfield.
EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT

THE TWO OFFICERS ENDED UP SPENDING HUNDREDS OF HOURS ON THE CASE
EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT

THEY EVEN BUILT A "WAR ROOM" DEDICATED TO THEIR RE-INVESTIGATION
They wrote lengthy, detailed reports, concluding:

1. that the evidence did **NOT** support the 1990 verdict of "guilty";
2. that I would **NOT** be convicted if the trial were held today; and
3. that the Governor of Virginia should grant me a **pardon**.
In May of 2018, Detective Sergeant Hudson decided to take another, even closer look at the many crime scene photographs. And he made an astonishing discovery.

Among his new findings were:

1. a shoeprint, marked 14DR, with the same boxy wave-like pattern as LR2.

And, more significantly,

2. a shoeprint found in the bar area of the living room (LR) which carries no letter or number designation and has a pattern that is clearly distinguishable from both LR2 and 14DR.
EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT

ORIGINAL CRIME SCENE PHOTOS

14DR

LR2

BAR AREA SHOEPRINT
EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT

DIGITALLY ENHANCED AND ZOOMED-IN CRIME SCENE PHOTOS

14DR

LR2

BAR AREA SHOEPRINT
Clearly, **TWO DIFFERENT SHOES** left prints at the crime scene!

But how can that be?

Prosecutor Jim Updike told the jury emphatically that only **ONE person** murdered the Haysoms: me.

**Could Mr. Updike's entire theory of the case be wrong?**
Before we jump to that conclusion, we need to eliminate the possibility that either of the two different shoeprints were left by the victims. Below are photos of the victims' shoes. Take a closer look at the soles: Neither one has a boxy wave-like tread or a deep "V" tread.
EPISODE 6: THE SHOEPRINT

TWO KINDS OF CRIME SCENE EVIDENCE

Sockprint LR3*

Shoeprint LR2

Shoeprint bar area (LR)

Blood Item 38K
Type B blood
Elizabeth Haysom's type,
found in only 10% of people
Not DNA-testable

Blood Item 6FE
Type O blood
XY chromosomes, therefore male
Different genetic profile from Jens Soering

Blood Items 23K#1 and 7FE#1
Type AB blood
XY chromosomes, therefore male and NOT Nancy Haysom's blood

* "... matches in size only with Ms. Haysom's print." (Russell Johnson affidavit)
The visual on the previous page shows that, at the crime scene, there are:

1. three different types of footprints, and
2. three different types of blood.

When two entirely different types of evidence tell the same story, then it is safe to conclude that this story is true.
At the time of this writing, I have been wrongfully incarcerated for 32 years for a crime which was committed by three perpetrators - as evidenced by the blood test results and shoeprints.

I am innocent.
The Soering Case Made Simple!

CONCLUSION

In addition to the evidentiary issues addressed in Episodes 1 to 6, you may want to consider the two facts below.

FACT: My attorney Richard Neaton lost his law license because, at the time of my trial, he was suffering from a "mental or emotional disability [that] materially impaired ... his ability to practice law."


FACT: Judge William Sweeney was a friend of Nancy Haysom's family for over forty years. Before my trial had even started, he said in a magazine interview that I "took the dare" and committed the crime.

(Source: Jennifer Engholm, "Judge Rejects Soering Appeal," Lynchburg News & Advance, March 5, 2003; see also Chapter 14 of "A Far, Far Better Thing," Lantern Books, 2017.)

The two FACTS above go to the basic fairness of my trial, and to the reliability of the verdict. Can anyone really be sure I am guilty, given that my lawyer was crazy and my judge was biased?