

US Supreme Court to Review Conviction Amidst Allegations of Evidence Suppression



In an unprecedented move, the United States Supreme Court has decided to entertain the claims of Richard Glossip, a death row inmate from Oklahoma. Glossip alleges that prosecutors suppressed crucial evidence to secure his conviction in a murder-for-hire case. This surprising decision by the predominantly conservative-led court, known for denying the majority of execution appeals, reflects the gravity of the allegations brought forward by Glossip.

Background of Richard Glossip's Case

Richard Glossip has been on death row since 1997, having been convicted of conspiring to murder his former boss, Barry Van Treese, who was brutally beaten to death. Despite Oklahoma setting nine execution dates for Glossip, he vehemently maintains his innocence. The notable aspect of this case is that even the state's top attorney has distanced himself from Glossip's conviction, acknowledging its questionable nature.

Want to know if you're earning what you deserve? Find out with LawCrossing's salary surveys.

Supreme Court's Involvement

The Supreme Court intervened in Glossip's case previously in 2015 when a scheduled execution date was put on hold while the court deliberated over the lethal injection drugs planned for use by the state. However, in the case of *Glossip v. Gross*, a 5-4 decision went against him, allowing the state to proceed with its execution plans.

The Current Challenge

The current legal challenge revolves around the core issue of the testimony provided by Justin Sneed, a key witness who asserted that Glossip had hired him to carry out the murder of Van Treese. Sneed, serving a life sentence, was instrumental in securing Glossip's conviction. However, recent revelations from documents disclosed by the state indicate that Sneed wanted to recant his testimony. He also alleged heavy coaching by the prosecution to align his story with the evidence presented, including false claims about seeing a psychiatrist.

Stay up-to-date without the overwhelming noise. Subscribe to JDJournal for a curated selection of the most relevant legal news.

Allegations of Suppressed Evidence

Glossip's petitions for review argue that crucial evidence, including Sneed's desire to recant and the coercion he faced during the trial, was intentionally suppressed. State Attorney General Gentner Drummond, recognizing the severe flaws in the case, has unsuccessfully sought to overturn Glossip's conviction. In a rare admission, Drummond acknowledged the injustice of proceeding with a capital sentence when the government's acknowledged failings marred the conviction.

The Path Forward

As the US Supreme Court takes on Glossip's case (*Glossip v. Oklahoma*, U.S., No. 22-7466), it brings to light the complexities surrounding the administration of justice and the potential consequences of prosecutorial misconduct. The outcome of this review will not only impact Glossip's fate but could also set a precedent for cases where suppressed evidence and errors during trial can potentially undermine the integrity of convictions in capital punishment cases.

Don't be a silent ninja! Let us know your thoughts in the comment section below.