STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF SCOTLAND

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

2015 AUG PRIMINAL SUPERIOR DIVISION

SCOTLAND COUNTILE NO: 88 CRS 1422

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

VS

ORDER

**CHARLES EDWARD MCINNIS** 

THIS MATTER COMING ON TO BE HEARD and being heard by the Bonorable Tanya Wallace upon a Consent Motion for Appropriate Relief by Kristy Newton, District Attorney for Judicial District 16a and Jonathan McInnis, Public Defender for Judicial District 16a pursuant to N.C.G.S. 15A-1411 – and 15A-1420 (e). The Court makes the FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT;

- 1. That the defendant was arrested on March 19, 1988, by officers with the Laurinburg Police Department;
- That the defendant was charged with the offenses of First Degree Rape, First Degree Burglary, and Armed Robbery;
- 3. That attorney, Charles Floyd was appointed to represent the defendant;
- 4. That the defendant appeared before the Honorable Robert Hobgood in the Superior Court of Scotland County on October 25, 1988, and that the defendant was duly sworn before the Clerk of Superior Court and entered pleas of guilty to the aforementioned charges;
- 5. That the Defendant signed and executed a plea transcript on that date;
- 6. That the Defendant was sentenced on October 25, 1988 by the Honorable Robert Hobgood, according to Fair Sentencing and from the presumptive range, to an active term of imprisonment in the North Carolina Department of Adult Correction of Life for the offense of First Degree Rape, following by a consecutive term of 20 years on the offenses of First Degree Burglary and Armed Robbery;
- 7. That based upon the Defendant's pleas of guilty on October 25, 1988, and the corresponding judgment of the Superior Court, the defendant is currently imprisoned at Brown Creek Correctional Institution through the North Carolina Department of Adult Correction;
- That the Defendant's claim of actual innocence came to the attention of the North Carolina Innocence Inquiry Commission and with the cooperation of the District Attorney of Judicial District 16A and the Laurinburg Police Department, items were submitted for DNA testing.

- That, although the Laurinburg Police Department requested DNA testing from Cellmark Diagnostics (currently known as Cellmark Forensics) in 1988, due to technology available at the time no DNA profile could be generated.
- 10 That on April 18, 1988, Cellmark Diagnostics issued a report indicating that no profile could be generated because the sample was unsuitable for testing.
- 11. That, using current technology, Cellmark Forensics analyzed certain items of physical evidence, and, using Y-STR SNA analysis, determined that the Defendant was excluded as a contributor of the male DNA from the sample;
- 12. That members of the North Carolina Innocence Inquiry Commission disclosed the results of the testing to District Attorney, Kristy Newton on August 5, 2015.
- 13. That, according to the prosecutor, one perpetrator and only one perpetrator was ever suggested by the victim for any of the crimes for which the Defendant pled guilty;

## BASED UPON THE FOREGOING FACT, THE COURT FINDS AS A CONCLUSION OF LAW, THAT

That certain new evidence is available that has a direct and actual bearing upon the Defendant's guilt or innocence;

IT IS NOW THEREFORE, ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Defendant is entitled at a minimum to a new trial for the charges and is released forthwith at this time.

DONE THIS THE 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2015.

Honorable Tanya Wallace

Superior Court Judge

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA				File No.	88CR\$001422	
SCOTLAND County			In The General Court Of Justice			
STATE Defendant	VERSUS		,	DISTILLE	☐ Superior Court Division	
EDWARD CHARLES MCINNIS			DISMISSAL			
			NOTICE OF REINSTATEMENT			
File Number					G.S. 15A-302(e), -931, -932, -1009	
88CRS001422	Count No.(s)	FIRST DEGREE	Offic	9088(8)	30=1577 001. 332, -1006	
	•					
88CRS001423	I	FIRST DEGREE	BURGLARY			
88CRS001424	I	ROBBERY WITH	H DANGEROUS WEAPON			
✓ DISMISSAL     NOTE: Recall all outstanding     The undersigned prosecutor     ☐ 1. No crime is charged.     ☐ 2. There is insufficient ev	enters a dismis: idence to warra	sal to the above che	arge(s) and assigns the	following re	эа\$опв:	
3. Defendant has agreed in exchange for a dism			gės:			
Defendant has been ex	onerated by Di			neled, or if e	vidence has been introduced, modify	
DISMISSAL WITH LEAVE The undersigned prosecutor e  1. The defendant failed to prosecutor believes the 2. The defendant has been a sent Article 82 of G.S. Chap 4. The defendant has been a sent Article 82 of G.S. Chap 5. Other: (specify)	onters a dismiss appear for a coat the defendant indicted and ered into a defender 15A.	t cannot readily be to cannot readily be for the format in a grand prosecution agoretic ago.	at which the defendant's found, und to be served with a prosective member of the prosective members.	attendanc n Order Fo cutor in acc	e was required and the or Arrest, cordance with the provisions of	
	Oge additional	iniomation on reve	rse.			
record reflects that the defen- custodial facility where the de	. 15A-931(a1), un es against the de dant is in custody ofendant is in cust	lless the defendent or fendant must be serve , the written dismissal tody.	the defendant's attorney h	as been othe	erwise notified by the prosecutor a	
	secutor (Type Or Pr. M. NEWTON	int)	Signature Of Proper	utor		
REINSTATEMENT	TON TON		1/11	yun	cuton	
This case, having previously be	een dismissed v	Vith leave as indicat	ed shove is now!!	)	,	
Name Of Pro:	secutor (Type Or Pri	nt)	Signature Of Prosect		II.	
OC-CR-307, Rev. 4/11 2011 Administrative Office of the Cor	urts	(Over				