

**Richard Ernest
Ballistics Expert**

The following report shows that Clinton was not and could not have been the shooter. This report helps to show that had the police and trial lawyers, properly performed their jobs, Clinton could have avoided being wrongfully convicted. You will also read in "Clinton's letter to lawyer," about how Clinton tried time and time again to get the ballistic reports done. He was unable to do so, do to the actions of Lisa Milstein and Gary Taylor. At the end of the report is the training and educational history of Mr. Richard Ernest, to show that he is highly qualified in the area of ballistic/forensic training we highly recommend Mr. Ernest. His law enforcement background and extensive training make him one of the leading experts in the field of ballistics.

Ballistics Results

RICHARD N. ERNEST, B.S.

Forensic Ballistics Consultant

7413 Arcadia Trail

Fort Worth, Texas 76137

Daytime (817)-228-6526

Evening (817)-485-1180

FAX (817)-498-6375

DRAFT OFFICIAL REPORT OF RESULTS

DATE: 4/06/06

TO: Mr. Ori White, Attorney at Law

RE: The TX vs. Clinton Young Case

EVIDENCE RECEIVED:

On 3/16/06 through 4/02/06 the following case related documentary evidence & physical evidence was sent to me for consideration:

Testimony of Mark Ray

Testimony of Dr. Jill Urban

Autopsy Report of Doyle Douglas

TX-DPS Firearms Laboratory Report by Mr. Tim Counce

Testimony of Tim Counce

Testimony of Ann Hinkle

Correspondence by Clinton Young

Numerous crime scene photographs

State's Exhibits # 9-11 from the trial of Clinton Young

SERVICES REQUESTED:

Examination of firearms related issues in relation to the case

RESULTS:

Examination of State's Exhibit # 11, which was recovered during autopsy by Dr. Jill Urban from the gunshot to the right side of the head of the victim - Doyle Douglas (listed as Gunshot Wound # 3), reveals that it is a .22LR caliber bullet with 8 lands & grooves with a right hand twist. This bullet is consistent with being fired by State's Exhibit # 5, the R-G .22LR revolver, which was admitted by witness Mark Ray (vol. 22, page 251) as the firearm he used to shoot Doyle Douglas with. It is asserted by Mark Ray, in his trial transcript testimony, that he fired a single shot into the back of the head of Doyle Douglas (vol. 22, page 228). This assertion is not supported by the physical evidence. The physical evidence is consistent with showing that Mark Ray, who admitted to using the R-G .22LR revolver, firing the shot into the right side of the victim's head. The shot to the back of the head of Doyle Douglas (listed as Gunshot Wound # 1 in the autopsy report), along with the shot to the left side of the head (listed as Gunshot Wound # 2 in the autopsy report) are revealed by the autopsy and later laboratory examinations at the TX-DPS Austin Laboratory to be consistent with being fired by the Colt Huntsman .22LR pistol (State's Exhibit # 3). The two recovered .22LR caliber bullets from these two shots are listed in the court record as State's Exhibit # 9 & 10. It was the trial testimony of Mark Ray that Clinton Young fired these two shots (first) into the victim, inside the automobile, using the Colt Huntsman .22LR pistol before Mark Ray (later) fired his one shot into the back of the head of the victim.

Because of the physical dimensions & limitations involved, it is the opinion of this examiner that it is unlikely that these two shots (State's Exhibits # 9 & 10) were fired inside the automobile by the front seat passenger Clinton Young, into the left side of the head & back of the head of the victim, Doyle Douglas, while he (the victim) was in the driver's position in the automobile. The finding of two fired .22LR cartridge cases in the car may not have been associated with the shots fired into the victim, but may have alternatively been associated with two shots fired in the automobile resulting in the damage seen to the steering wheel & dash area of the car. If the automobile is still available for gunshot residue (bullet wipe) testing on these areas, then such testing should be conducted. It is noted in the photographs of the automobile that several shots were fired at the automobile from outside the car. It is unknown by this author at this time whether the fired bullets or cartridge cases from these shots were ever recovered. If recovered, such fired bullets & cartridge cases should be compared in the laboratory to the firearms recovered in this case.

It is further the opinion of this examiner that the profound inconsistencies discovered between the physical evidence associated with this shooting incident and the sworn testimony at trial by Mark Ray should cast doubt on the truthfulness of the account(s) rendered by Mark Ray in the matter of this case.

All opinions stated above are stated within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, and are the opinions developed by the author of this report based upon the documentation provided, the physical evidence and the testing performed by the author at the time of the writing of this report. If new or other evidence should come to light it may or may not have an influence on the opinions expressed in this report depending on the nature of the evidence.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard N. Ernest, B.S.

Forensic Consultant

Our search keyword phrases are listed here for our friends and supporters. Clinton Lee Young, Clinton L. Young, Texas Death Row, Clinton Young on Death Row, death row texas, texas death penalty, death penalty innocent, innocent on death row, abolish the death penalty, death penalty moratorium, death penalty deterrence, anti death penalty, against the death penalty, injustice, save an innocent life and innocent life on death row.

All contributions are most welcome! Thank you!

info@saveaninnocentlife.com