

Nomothethic Profiles

Throughout this text we have repeated the assertion that nomo-inductive methods of profiling predict offender characteristics based on aggregated past similar cases, while ideo-deductive methods examine and interpret behavioral patterns for offender characteristics based on a study of the case at hand. The problem is, students new to criminal profiling (and most others) have infrequently seen a criminal profile and may cling to the belief that there is more to it than that. Surely the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and other professional profilers have developed advanced methods that are more comprehensive than just quoting old research or guessing based on past experience. Surely there is reason beneath their profiles—a hidden wisdom of some kind. Unfortunately this is not often the case, as may be evidenced by the profiles provided in this appendix.

CONTENTS

CIA: *CA V. Gilbert Romero*

IP: The Madjenko, Mascav, and Eve Case

Baton Rouge Serial Killer

CIA: *CA V. GILBERT ROMERO*

Note that this profile was put together by SSA Mark Safarik in preparation for expert testimony, after a suspect had been arrested, for the purposes of assisting with the prosecution. It was not prepared in the investigative phase. Moreover, the fax cover sheet prepared by SSA Safarik refers to the report as the “EDGAR Profile.”

February 7, 2000

GILBERT ROMERO

SHAWNA MICHELLE EDGAR—VICTIM (DECEASED);

YOLO COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT,

YOLO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

10/23/1995

NCAVC—HOMICIDE (EXPERT TESTIMONY)¹

The following crime analysis was prepared by Supervisory Special Agent (SSA) Mark Safarik, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC), Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with other members of the NCAVC.

¹All spelling and grammar mistakes are reproduced as per the original document.

This analysis is based on a thorough review of submitted investigative materials and conversations with Investigators Pete Blakeman, Yolo County, California, District Attorney's Office. The investigative materials used in this analysis included: investigative reports, autopsy report, crime scene photographs, crime scene diagrams, autopsy photographs, forensic reports and victimology. The purpose of this analysis was to be behaviourally assess the overall crime scene and the offender's interaction with the victim. The NCAVC factored into this assessment the level of familiarity at the crime scene, the high risk nature of the crime for the offender, the degree of control exercised over the victim, the nature of the attack, the victimology and specific targeting of the victim, the location of the victim's injuries and the lack of sexual assault.

It is not a substitute for a thorough, well planned investigation and should not be considered all inclusive. Any information provided is based on reviewing, analysing, and researching criminal cases similar to the case submitted by your agency. The final analysis is based upon probabilities, noting however, that no two criminal acts or criminal personalities are exactly alike and, therefore, the offender at times may not always fit the analysis in every category.

This analysis contains information of a confidential and sensitive nature and is provided for your investigative assistance. It should not be disseminated except to other criminal justice agencies with a legitimate investigative or prosecutorial interest in this matter. For convenience in the preparation of this report, the offender will be referred to in the masculine gender.

Victimology

Examination of the victim's background is a significant part of the analysis process. Her vulnerability to becoming the victim of a violent crime was examined in conjunction with a review of her lifestyle, reputation, behavior, personal history, and social and sexual habits. Specifically, what was it about this victim or her situation which made her susceptible to becoming a victim of a violent crime?

The victim, SHAWNA MICHELLE EDGAR, was an 18-year-old White female in good physical condition. At the time of her death EDGAR was dating a Hispanic male (boyfriend) who had recently been released from jail. Prior to his incarceration he was reported to have been trafficking in narcotics. He asked another male to handle his drug clients during the time of his incarceration. Investigators reported that EDGAR began to have an intimate relationship with this second male. Investigation revealed that her boyfriend learned of EDGAR'S involvement with this male. Upon his release from jail, the boyfriend attempted to regain control of his drug clients but was unsuccessful. Investigators also said that EDGAR was reportedly trafficking drugs and had been using both marijuana and methamphetamine. By her lifestyle, EDGAR placed herself in a large population of individuals who often have a propensity toward a violent crime. She regularly exposed herself to a segment of society which often resorts to violence to resolve disagreements.

Overall, we would suggest that EDGAR voluntarily placed herself in high risk situations (drug dealing and narcotics use) and associated with individuals who also engaged in high risk activity. EDGAR would be considered a high risk victim and statistically more likely to become the victim of a violent crime. Based upon the nature and location of the homicide and the subsequent activity at the crime scene, it would be highly unlikely that her death was at the hands of a total stranger. We feel the offender targeted her, a point that will be more appropriately addressed under the *Crime Scene Analysis* section of this report.

Medical Examiner's Report

The medical examination of the victim is complete and specific details are retrievable from that report. The purpose of this section is to discuss the significant findings of the Medical Examiner (ME), to address the significance of the victim injuries and other activity by the offender.

EDGAR died as a result of a single gunshot wound to the back of the head. The projectile was located just under the scalp, at the margins of the bevelled edge of the skull fracture. The bullet had not exited the skull. The lack of soot and powder residue in the hair and on the underpaying skin suggest that the end of the barrel was at least 24 inches from the skull.²

A review of the crime scene photographs revealed that EDGAR had very long fingernails. The nails do not appear to be damaged and the ME does not identify any breakage or defect. The victim has a minimal number of identifiable external injuries. The injuries which are identified consist mainly of slight abrasions and contusions. The contusions are mainly located in the area of the left eye. There are no injuries consistent with a major physical confrontation. This suggests that the victim did not get into a physical altercation with the offender. The fact that the victim was shot in the back of the head suggests that she did not perceive the offender to pose a threat until it was too late. There is no indication that the victim attempted to flee from the offender. The victim's sandals were located immediately downhill from her location. The MO opined that the shot was downward which is consistent with the offender standing uphill from the victim. Although not noted in the ME's report, investigators reported that the ME indicated that the shot was not immediately fatal and the victim could have lived for a short period of time after being shot. The ME described two ante mortem abrasions located on the inner aspect of the upper left arm at locations six and eight inches below the axillary fossa. A point which will be appropriately addressed under the *Crime Scene Analysis* section of this report.

The ME opined that the victim was not sexually assaulted. The victim also had several rings on her fingers which were not disturbed and her purse was found undisturbed on the front passenger floorboard of her boyfriend's vehicle. There is nothing related to the injuries sustained by EDGAR which would indicate that more than one offender was involved.

²Di Maio M. D., and Vincent J. M. (1985) *Gunshot Wounds: Practical Aspects of Firearms Ballistics [sic] and Forensic Techniques*, Elsevier, p. 114.

Crime Scene Analysis

While no attempt will be made to construct a precise chronological scenario of this crime, certain observations about the crime scene, how the victim was killed and their possible significance as they relate to the offender will be described.

On 10/23/1995, EDGAR'S boyfriend reported that he was driving his car, a Chrysler Le Baron with his girlfriend, EDGAR, in the front passenger seat. They had followed another car to different areas in north Sacramento and finally to a remote area in Yolo County. He parked his vehicle behind the truck which they had followed out there. The boyfriend reported that there were two males in the truck. Edgar was reported to have been good friends with the driver. The area was dark with no street lights. The vehicles had parked directly adjacent to a bridge on a dirt shoulder area of the roadway. This shoulder area led down a rocky pathway to the edge of a canal. The boyfriend reported that he and the driver of the other vehicle walked down the path in the dark to the water's edge. Although he told EDGAR to remain in the vehicle he reported that she came down to his location and was standing behind him to his right approximately four feet. The boyfriend said he heard a gunshot and reported "I just seen her hair go like this and a piece of her head just fly in the air." He reported diving into the canal as more shots rang out around him. He said the male shot his girlfriend and then tried to shoot him. He later reported going back to his car to find one of the tires flat. The boyfriend reported that he remained in the area, hiding in the canal water most of the night because he was afraid that the individual that shot EDGAR would return to shoot him. Around eight o'clock in the morning, the boyfriend made contact with law enforcement and lead them to EDGAR'S body.

A review of the crime scene photographs and reports from the investigators show that EDGAR'S body was located approximately six feet from the water's edge. She was lying on her back wedged between several large pieces of concrete on her left side and a smaller piece on her right. Despite a gunshot wound to her head, the only blood located at the scene was in the area of the victim's head. Bloodstains located on the rocks underneath her head would be identified as swipes (the movement of the victim's bloody head across non-contaminated objects). The quantity of the blood on the dirt suggests that the victim's head rested above those locations only briefly, but long enough for some drainage of blood to have occurred.

Forensic evaluation of the bullet removed from the victim's skull revealed that it came from either a .38 or .380 caliber handgun. .380 caliber shell casings were recovered near the Le Baron and the tire of that vehicle had been shot by a bullet later identified as a .380. No shell casings were located near the victim and the fact that the bullets are forensically different, suggests that the bullet recovered from the victim was most likely a .38 caliber fired from a revolver. Because of the extremely long hair of the victim and the caliber of round used to kill her, it is apparent that a majority of the blood which had drained from the wound had been absorbed by the victim's hair. This observation is supported by the minimal blood spatter stains near the victim's head.

A review of the crime scene photographs revealed that both of the victim's sandals were adjacent to, but downhill from her. The position of the sandals suggests that she was moved from the location where she was originally shot to the location where her body was discovered (her final resting place). It is likely that the sandals slipped off as she was being moved. The sandals are in line with her feet and consistent with having been drug uphill. Noted in the crime scene photographs are several areas on the dirt underneath the victim that appear to be wet. Investigators confirmed that the back of the victim's shirt was damp and that there were several locations of wetness on the soil under the victim. Investigators also confirmed that the dirt around not only the victim, but also the immediate crime scene, except near the water's edge, was quite dry and that no other similar areas of wet soil were found. There was no indication that the victim was ever in the water. This suggests that an intermediate object, that was wet, came into contact with the victim before she was placed in the position in which she was found.

The victim was found on her back with her legs together and her arms down to her sides. Her position is consistent with having been drug up hill to that location. Having been shot from behind and facing downhill, it is highly unlikely that she could have fallen into the position in which she was found. The location of her sandals would also be inconsistent with that scenario. Her position is however, most consistent with having been drug from behind with the offender having held her up under her arms. The ME described two ante mortem abrasions location [sic] on the inner aspect of the upper left arm. If the offender had drug the victim from behind and held her under her arms, these injuries would correspond with her having been moved in that manner.

Also located underneath the victim was a pager belonging to the boyfriend of the victim. It is clear that the pager had to have been in that position prior to the victim being placed there as the pager is completely covered by her left thigh. In considering how the pager ended up beneath the victim, two scenarios seem most probable. It could have occurred if the boyfriend walked along the route to the water and it accidentally fell from his person, or if he had moved the victim and the pager became dislodged in the process of moving her. A review of the crime scene photographs revealed that a worn pathway from the shoulder area of the roadway to the water existed and passed approximately four to five feet east of the victim's body. This path is the most likely means of travel between the water's edge and the shoulder of the road. Therefore, we believe that it is unlikely that the boyfriend walked off the path and over the concrete blocks where he dropped it accidentally as he walked to the water's edge.

As previously mentioned, the victim was wearing jewelry on both hands and her purse was located undisturbed on the floorboard of the car. There is nothing to suggest that robbery was the motive for this homicide as nothing was removed from the victim or her purse. There is also nothing to suggest that there was any sexual motivation for the homicide as EDGAR'S clothing was undisturbed. She was wearing a bra and panties which were both positioned correctly on her body. The most likely position of the offender (behind the victim when she was shot) suggests that the victim was unaware of the threat and thus had not perceived the offender to be a threat. There is nothing observed in the crime scene behavior to suggest

that the victim and offender were engaged in an argument that escalated into a physical confrontation and eventually to the act of murder. The NCAVC's experience suggests that in such confrontations the victim usually sustains noticeable blunt force trauma as she attempts to defend herself against the offender's assault. In such confrontations it is not uncommon to see the victim, if she is a female, to sustain broken or damaged fingernails. Because of the location and the lack of available lighting, an attempt by EDGAR to flee the threat would likely have caused her to fall resulting in both soil debris and abrasion and contusion injuries to her knees and hands. Nothing corresponding to that is identified on the victim or her clothing. Due to the condition of the terrain, it is likely that the victim walked to the water's edge of her own volition. The victim felt comfortable both at the location and with her boyfriend.

Due to the lack of observable physical interaction between the offender and the victim prior to the shooting and the absence of any identifiable motives (i.e., robbery and sexual assault), we would offer that the offender brought his anger with him. He had a plan to kill the victim prior to his arrival there, he brought a gun as part of his plan and upon arrival at that isolated location, he executed that plan. Because the murder weapon was not recovered, it is clear the offender removed the weapon because he perceived that it could have been linked to him. The NCAVC would offer that there is no indication that the victim's murder resulted from the escalation of a confrontation between the victim and the offender. The offender brought his anger with him and executed a plan that he previously thought out. This anger most likely is the result of an unresolved (or perceived) conflict between the offender and the victim. This unresolved or perceived conflict was the result of a pre-existing interpersonal problem which he believed could only be alleviated by the victim's death. Such anger does not develop as a result of a casual contact. This suggests that some significant relationship existed between them. The nature and style of this murder is a personal one and the victim was specifically targeted.

Of considerable interest in this case, is the movement of the body subsequent to the homicide. Body disposal is defined as a manner in which an offender chooses to dispose of a deceased victim's body. After the offender has killed the victim, he is confronted with the problem of what to do with the body. The body disposition site is vitally important because: (1) it can separate the offender from the victim and the crime; (2) it can allow the offender continued access to the victim for various reasons, and (3) it can prevent or delay an investigation and the collection of physical evidence. The offender initially has to decide whether or not he will transport the body. Subsequent to that decision he has three choices for each: (1) he can dump or discard the body; (2) he can display the body; or (3) he can bury or conceal the body.

When an offender dumps a body, there is little or no effort made to conceal it. It can be left at the homicide scene or transported to another location. When the offender disposes of a body in this manner he is attempting to minimize the time he spends getting rid of the body in order to decrease

his risk of being caught. The offender's desire to put time and distance between him and the crime is usually the primary objective. This type of body disposal usually shows little or no regard for the victim and his association with that victim.

For a stranger, there is no emotional investment with the victim and thus no personal need to interact with the victim once the homicide occurs. A stranger does not perceive that he can be connected to the body in any way. Nevertheless, a stranger may move the victim's body as part of his disposal plan by concealing it. EDGAR was located only a few feet from a creek with heavy brush covered banks into which the offender could have placed her. The surrounding area was covered with head high heavy brush within which the offender could have concealed EDGAR and in all likelihood significantly delayed her discovery. In consideration of these avenues of disposal, the offender moved the body only a short distance. Despite being moved, the victim remained completely exposed. In terms of concealing the victim's body, the movement of her body provided no benefit to the offender in distancing himself from the homicide.

The NCAVC has observed in many cases, offenders interact with their homicide victims in a manner described as "Undoing." Undoing behavior are actions engaged in by an offender who has a close association with the victim and tries symbolically to undue a homicide (e.g., washing the victim, placing the victim into a more comfortable position suggestive of resting or sleeping, washing up by the offender, etc.). Undoing is usually based on an attitude of caring and remorse. The movement and subsequent placement of EDGAR reflects care on the part of the offender. The NCAVC would describe the offender's interaction with the victim's body in terms of both her movement and placement as undoing. If moving the victim from one location to another was the offender's main concern, it would have been easier and more expedient to drag the victim either by her hair or one or both of her hands. This would have required the least amount of effort by the offender. The most likely method of movement as discussed earlier, requires much more effort. In addition, moving the victim as previously discussed would allow her upper back area to come in contact with the front part of the offender's body. If this area of the offender's body were wet, this could explain the dampness associated with the victim's back and the area of soil immediately underneath it.

Summary

In assessing this particular crime, it is important to consider the totality of the events and crime scene behavioural manifestations. We find that the following items of behavioural evidence left by the offender are significant:

- The manner in which this victim was killed indicates she was not expecting it. It is highly unlikely this victim would have accompanied someone to such a dark and isolated area unless it was someone she trusted. There is nothing to indicate that the victim was restrained in any way. EDGAR did not perceive herself to be in danger and did not realize the threat until it was too late.

- We feel that the offender went with EDGAR to the crime scene location to “settle” this unresolved (or perceived) conflict. The lack of any other observable physical interaction with her suggests that the purpose of going to the crime scene location was to execute the plan, which in this case was to kill her.
- From this position in which EDGAR likely collapsed after being shot, the offender moved her body up the hill a short distance and laid her down with care as evidenced by her position. The ME opined that she could have lived for a short period of time after being shot. The offender may have had second thoughts about the shooting and began to move her body up the hill toward the car. Because the distance of the movement was relatively short and did not aid in concealing her body, it is likely the offender was interrupted which forced him to cease his action.
- We believe the offender was not a *total* stranger, but instead someone who had a fairly close relationship with the victim. We believe the offender acted alone; that is, there was no more than one person at the murder scene.
- There is no observable behavior which would suggest that the motive for the killing was either sexual or for financial gain.
- Given the fact that the killing was likely preplanned and based upon the offender’s perception the victim’s death was necessary. Over time, the offender will justify the death as being the victim’s fault because she (the victim) made the offender do it. The offender’s only concern would be detection.

In the event your department wished further consultation in this matter, you may contact Supervisory Special Agent Mark Safarik directly on the National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, telephone number (703) 632-4342. Refer to case number 252B-IR-5614.

IP: THE MADJENKO, MASCAV, AND EVE CASE

The following nomo-inductive investigative psychology-based profile is taken from Alison (2005) and can be found in its entirety on pages 249–277. This report was prepared on January 16, 2004, by Laurence Alison, Alasdair Goodwill, and Emily Alison and is titled as follows:

The Madjenko, Mascav and Eve Case: A Study in Linking and Suspect Prioritization.

...

Executive Summary

The following summarizes the key point of this document. This does not serve as an alternative to the full document, merely as an aide-memoire of the core features of our report.

1. There are a number of areas where we cannot be certain of the sequence of events. The enquiry team should proceed with the

enquiry with a number of parallel scenarios in mind. Some of these are likely to prove more resource intensive than others but there are some that could be conducted quickly and with minimal resources. In out view, basic and complex searches could be conducted in parallel. The enquiry team may wish to divide up sub-teams to deal with these scenarios. Each scenario may be moderated in light of new evidence.

2. In light of the above, we recommend “worst case scenario” planning. Thus, one must consider that the offences are linked and represent a serial murder enquiry in which further victims may be attacked and other bodies may be found that are linked to these offences.
3. In our view, the most productive behavioural lines of enquiry are likely to stem from careful consideration of the geographic information rather than characteristics of the offenders. The fact that the enquiry team have three sites (the bus depot and the disposal sites) can be further explained.

Caveats

Primarily, the processes reported here are to do with inference and not evidence. They are not intended to point towards the innocence or guilt of the individual or make an inculpatory claim against an individual who may become a prime suspect for the enquiry team in relation to other possible offences. Most importantly, none of the information provided should ever be used as a basis for any legal action. This report is merely designed as an investigative tool to be used at the enquiry team’s discretion. The recommendations in this report are based upon the information given to Prof. Alison, Mr Goodwill and Mrs Alison. The report is based on research and investigations conducted in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States. Caution must therefore be exercised in interpreting the extent to which these figures transfer to Eastern European cases. No part of this report should be distributed to anyone other than individuals in the enquiry team. Permission may be granted through direct contact with Prof. Alison.

It should also be made clear that there are a range of plausible scenarios that could account for each victim’s death/disappearance and figures reported are NOT derived in order to exclude suspects, merely to generate probabilities. Thus, offenders outside a particular age range or distance from the offence should not be excluded; they are just less probable given the scientific evidence.

Sources of Inference

It is important to clearly state the assumptions that this report subsumes. These relate directly to the psychological, behavioural and scientific analysis of the key components of the disappearance of Madjenko, the murder and sexual assault of Mascav and the murder of Eve. It is further stressed that the suggestions, inferences and conclusions contained within this report are based upon these assumptions and should not be extrapolated to explain other aspects of the case that do not fall under the framework of these assumptions.

Current Research on Abduction Murder

The following section describes the figures on prevalence of this sort of offence, the circumstances surrounding the offences (and the extent to which they are in line with other abductions); possible characteristics of the offender(s) and the probable sequence of events. We are assuming that this is a non-family abduction murder. However, we would remind the enquiry team that individuals familiar (where familiarity can mean a casual acquaintance of friend) to the child are more often responsible for child murders than strangers (Boudreaux, Lord and Jarvis, 2001).

Characteristics of the Offence

(unless stated, figures are from Hanfland, Keppel and Weis, 1997; US study)

- Abduction of juveniles (under 16 years of age) is **rare** (2% of violent crime against juveniles).
- Most victims are **girls** (76%), average age **11 years** old (supported by Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra, 1999)
- 58% reported as “missing child” with, typically, a **two hour delay in making the initial report** from the time of abduction.
- Children were “...**not particularly vulnerable or high risk victims**” (p. 21).

Thus, there is nothing especially unusual about any of the victims in these regards, though Amelie is a little older than the average age. However, we have been informed that she looks physically younger.

Victim Selection, Procurement and Disposal

- 80% of cases **initial contact** between the killer and the victim is within $\frac{1}{4}$ **mile of the victim's residence**.
- 57% of victim selection is opportunistic.
- 15% selected on the basis of a prior relationship with victim.
- Two-thirds use a ‘blitz’ attack—the majority are **not** subtle, clever predators using deceptive means to abduct.
- Non-family abduction is often associated with other offences such as robbery or sexual assault, as a means of **isolating** the child (Finkelhor and Ormrod, 2000).
- **Family involvement is less likely than stranger offenders** for victims in this age group (Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra, 1999).
- The vast majority (74%) of the abducted children who are murdered are **dead within three hours of the abduction**.
- 52% conceal the body.

Thus, on the balance of probabilities this is an opportunistic offence and Amelie, Famke and Eve would have been murdered within three hours. It is unlikely that they were selected on the basis of prior relationships with the offender. The victims were most likely taken in order for the offender to isolate them for the purpose of sexually assaulting them.

Characteristics of Offenders Offender's relationship to victim

- Prentky, Knight, Burgess, Ressler, Campbell and Lanning (1991) examined the differences between 97 abducting and 60 non-abducting child molesters who were committed to the Massachusetts Treatment Centre for sexually dangerous persons in the US. The offenders were examined on selected typological and antisocial/criminal variables, and the results identified a number of general characteristics of abductors, such as low contact with children, low social competence, and stranger relationships with victims.
- **It is highly unlikely that the offender in this case is a family member. There is a much greater chance that the offender is a stranger or an acquaintance of the victim.** Sexual assault is highly unlikely to precede the murder of a child by a parent. The Bureau of Justice in the US reports that when a person under 12 is murdered a family member is the most likely suspect. However, when family members killed their children the rate of sexual assault occurring prior to death was 1%.
- In the CATCHEM database of sexual murders of children in the United Kingdom, when the victim was a female child, age 6 to 21, there was a 44% chance that the offender was an acquaintance, and 21% chance that the offender was a stranger. However, in cases where the victim's body was transported by the offender:
 - 53% are committed by a killer who is a **stranger** to the victim.
 - 39% are committed by a **friend or acquaintance** of the victim.
 - **Family involvement** in this type of case is relatively **infrequent** (9%).

Offender's Age

- The offender is likely to be within an age range of 28 to 35 (CATCHEM). However, age has proven an extremely difficult variable to "profile." No suspect should be eliminated solely on the basis that he does not fall within the profiled age range.
- Although the average age of child sexual murderers in Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra's (1999) study was 27 years old with the great majority under 30, the CATCHEM data indicates that when the victim's body is transported from the scene of the murder the offender's most likely age group is around 30 to 35 years old. Offenders who do not transport their victims tend to be younger, around age 18 to 25 years old.

Offender's Probably Location

- The offender may have attempted to lure victims to a secure place, likely indoors (i.e., his home) in order to carry out the assault.
- The National Institute of Justice Census reports that for US child molesters, 75% of the assaults occurred in the offender's or victim's home.
- Canter, Heritage and Kovacic (1989) conducted a study of cases of adult sexual assault and found that offenders who commit offences outdoors are unlikely to also offend against victims indoors.

- Due to the lack of forensic evidence found at the site where the body was disposed of in both Mascav and Eve, it is likely that the offender assaulted and strangled victims in another location from where the body was discovered. After the attack he transported victims to the disposal site. This attack location is therefore likely to be indoors and nearby the abduction site.
- The vast majority of offenders in the CATCHEM study lived within five miles of the point of contact with the victim; 95% had their residence there; 3% had work, previous residence, or relatives within five mile radius of the point of encounter. All offenders were within a 20-mile radius of point of contact with the victim.
- 37% of offenders in the CATCHEM database who transported their victim went less than 9 miles from the point of contact to dispose of the body of the victim.
- Previous research has demonstrated that an offender's initial crimes tend to be closer to his/her home than later ones, and that in fact, the first offence is usually nearest home (Barker, 1989).

Research on serial murder has revealed that abduction patterns reflect this trend of moving out from the offender's home as the series progresses. However, as a series progresses through seven or eight abduction-murders, the "points of fatal encounter" commonly revert back, drawing once again closer to the killer's home (Godwin and Canter, 1997)...

Miscellaneous statistics of child abduction murderers (HANfland, Keppel and Weis, 1997)

- 50% unemployed
- 62% were Caucasian (Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra, 1999).
- 70% of offenders lived within 5 miles of the abduction site (Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra, 1999).
- Those that do have jobs are in "unskilled" or "semi-skilled" labour occupations.
- 28% (5 times greater than the next common occupation) are employed as construction workers.
- Of those killers who were 27 years old and over, 34% still lived with their parents, 32% were alcohol abusers and 27% were drug abusers.
- 60% have prior arrests for violent crimes (53% of these were assaults and/or sexual assaults perpetrated against children).
- 28% of prior arrests are for murders (or attempted murders) of children and 19% of these have histories of kidnapping children.
- 64% have previous convictions for crimes against children.
- Most are not in any official custody status at the time of the offence, however, 27% are either on parole or probation (of these previous offences against children).
- 67% of cases the MO were similar to that in the abduction murder.
 - 70% were consistent in the way they committed the crime.
 - 28% consistently chose similar victims.

- 21% similar in approach to victim.
- 17% consistent in the specific acts committed against the child.
- 69% of cases involve a **sexual component**.
- Most common precipitating stressors are “conflict with a female” (45%) or a “criminal legal problem” (36%).

Thus, this offender is most likely a stranger who is unskilled and with previous convictions. He is more likely to not be married (56% are not married), but married men should *not* be excluded. Preconvictions are most likely to involve violent crimes and crimes against children. Of all possible forms of employment, the most likely is a construction worker. There are a variety of ways in which this offender is likely to have tried to commit a similar offence—either through MO, a similar victim, a similar approach and/or in the acts committed. We should emphasize that not all these qualities are likely to be consistent from crime to crime (thus, one might have similar MO but a different victim type), although in this case (if the offences are linked) the offender appears relatively consistent in terms of selecting girls between the age of 12–14 at weekends between 10am–12pm. In general, some aspects of this offence is likely to be present in previous offences (i.e., attempted abductions)....

Investigative Recommendations/Suggested Lines of Enquiry

Are these Offences Linked?

Given the relatively high percentage chance that a similar type of offence has been committed before (or attempted), a strong emphasis must be placed on investigating other abduction attempts and other missing person enquiries. We recommend that, if the enquiry team have not already done so, they seriously consider *any* other off-road abduction offence as a serious potential link to this case (particularly given the very rare nature of such offences; see Hanfland *et al.* (1997) for US figures. CATCHEM for UK figures. Further, Boudreaux, Lord and Dutra (1999) found that the transportation of the victim over long distances (>10 miles) was not uncommon when victims were between 12 and 14 years of age.

In light of the research discussed above and details of this specific case, we suggest that the search should be guided by the following parameters.

- Abductions, attempted abductions, abduction rapes and abduction murders
- 9–19 year old female victim
- Vehicle used in abduction
- NO clothing found

However, although the search should be on a national scale we agree that any offence with these parameters within a 30-mile radius of all three of the sites (Mascav’s body, Eve’s body, abduction site of Madjenko) be prioritised over national offences and investigated first. All prioritised points of interest should be plotted into a map and subjected to geographical profiling analysis.

BATON ROUGE SERIAL KILLER

Between 2001 and 2002, in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana, area, a serial murderer killed five female victims, four white and one black. Some of them were linked by DNA. As Savidge and Harris (2003) explain:

The murders began in Baton Rouge in September 2001, when [Gina Wilson] Green, 41, was found strangled near the campus of Louisiana State University.

In May 2002, [Charlotte Murray] Pace, 22, was found stabbed to death in her home, also near the LSU campus; and in July, [Pamela P.] Kinamore, 44, was abducted and her throat was slit. Kinamore's body was found 30 miles outside Baton Rouge, in the direction of Lafayette.

The body of [Trineisha Dene] Colomb, 23, was found in a wooded area November 24, about 20 miles from where her abandoned car was discovered.

The body of [Carrie Lynn] Yoder, 26, an LSU graduate student, was found in March near the Whiskey Bay Bridge off Interstate 10 outside Baton Rouge, the spot where another victim was found. An autopsy found Yoder was strangled after being beaten and raped.

Background information related to the profiling aspect of the investigation is taken from *Koehler v. Englade et al.* (2006):³

This case arises out of a massive law enforcement search for a serial killer who terrorized south Louisiana beginning in 2001. Over the span of a year, three women were brutally raped and murdered in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. From DNA evidence left at the crime scenes, analysts with the Louisiana State Police Crime Lab were able to link all three murders to the same, then-unknown male perpetrator.

As part of the investigation into the serial killer's identity, agents with the Behavioral Analysis Unit (BAU) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) created a Criminal Investigative Analysis, or "profile," which identified certain behaviors and personality traits of the perpetrator. In addition to

³As explained in *Koehler v. Englade et al.* (2006), Shannon Koehler, a suspect in the serial murder case who turned out to be innocent, sued those authorities involved for violation of his civil rights related to obtaining his DNA for exclusionary purposes:

Koehler brought suit against Detective Johnson, Chief Englade, the City, the Parish of East Baton Rouge, and East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff Elmer Litchfield, asserting that the taking of his DNA violated his rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 5 of the Louisiana Constitution. In his Complaint, Koehler alleged that the affidavit submitted by Detective Johnson to procure the seizure warrant did not provide probable cause to believe that Koehler was the serial killer and concealed from Judge Anderson exculpatory facts, namely, that Koehler was pardoned for his burglary conviction, that he had not worked in the area where the victim's cell phone was found for over a decade, and that he could not have made the bloody footprint left at the crime scene. Accordingly, Koehler sought damages and the expungement of his DNA profile from any place where it had been stored...

The district court found that the facts within Detective Johnson's knowledge, including the FBI profile, were sufficient to support a finding of probable cause.

providing a behavioral and psychological analysis of the perpetrator, the profile suggested that the perpetrator would likely be between 25 and 35 years of age, employed in a job that required physical strength, and financially insecure. Based on a bloody footprint left at one of the crime scenes, the profile also indicated that the perpetrator wore a size 10 to 11 shoe.

To coordinate the work being done by the FBI with the efforts of state and local authorities, the City formed the Multi-Agency Homicide Task Force (the “Task Force”). The Task Force, hoping to generate leads on the serial killer’s identity, released the FBI profile to the public and established a “tip line,” which received over 5,000 tips concerning possible suspects. After analyzing the tips, Task Force investigators contacted more than 600 men, including Kohler, in an effort to collect oral saliva swabs for DNA comparison.

The DNA dragnet employed by the task force was guided in no small part by the criminal profile prepared by the FBI’s BAU, specifically FBI profiler Mary Ellen O’Toole (Noel, 2003). The task force released that profile to the public via the media, as well via its website at <http://brgov.com/taskforce/>. The complete and unredacted profile is provided here.

Multi-Agency Homicide Task Force

Post Office Box 3652

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3652

225-389-3310 (Toll Free) 1-866-389-3310

The following offender profile is provided by The Behavioral Analysis Unit (BAU) which is a component of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC) which is located at the FBI Academy, Quantico, Virginia.

Criminal profiling is a process now known as “criminal investigative analysis.” Profilers, or Criminal Investigative Analysts are highly trained and experienced FBI Agents who study every behavioral and forensic aspect and detail of an unsolved violent crime scene in which a certain amount of psychopathology has been left at the scene.

Psychopathology is an offender’s behavioral and psychological indicators that are left at a violent crime scene as a result of his physical, sexual, and in some cases verbal interaction with his victim(s). A profile, or criminal investigative analysis is an investigative tool, and its value is measured in terms of how much assistance it provides to the investigator.

Baton Rouge law enforcement and the FBI recognize that it is not typical to publicly release any portion of a profile in a serial homicide investigation. However, it is the opinion of the FBI’s Behavioral Analysis Unit (BAU) that there are persons in the Baton Rouge area who know this offender and may even suspect he is responsible for the deaths of Gina Green, Charlotte Murray Pace, and Pam Kinamore. Identifying what the BAU believes some of the offender’s key personality and behavioral traits, gleaned from

the three crime scenes, may give the person who knows him, whether it is a co-worker, family member, or friend, the confidence to contact law enforcement.

It is important to note that no one or two traits or characteristics should be considered in isolation or given more weight than the others. Any one of the traits, or several, can be seen in people who have never committed a crime. Instead, these behavioral traits and characteristics should be considered in their totality.

- Based on the age range of the victims and their physical appearances, the age of this male offender is estimated to be somewhere between 25 and 35 years of age. However, no suspect should be eliminated on the basis of his chronological age.
- This offender is physically strong and capable of lifting a weight of at least 155–175 pounds. Crime Scene information indicates a shoe size of approximately 10 to 11.
- His socio-economic situation is likely average or even below average for the Baton Rouge area. In other words, his finances would be tight. His employment is likely to be in a job which requires physical strength, and does not involve significant or regular interaction with the public. He does not have a certain amount of mobility either from his employment, lifestyle or both.
- These homicides occurred on two Fridays and a Sunday. It is possible that on these days this offender was not accountable to anyone, unlike the rest of the week where he was accountable due to his employment or for some other reason.
- This offender appears to have developed limited information about the three victims—before the homicides. Because he put himself in a position to see them, observe them, or even casually run into them prior to the assaults, he would have obtained information about where they lived, and something about their patterns of behavior. However, it is important to point out that following these women could have involved merely “spot” checks which would not have raised the women’s level of suspicion or awareness. This offender may also have perceived more of a “relationship” with these women than what was there. He may have even “bragged” to other, co-workers, other male friends, about having different relationships with certain very attractive—well-off women, without identifying these women specifically.
- This offender wants to be seen as someone who is attractive and appealing to women. However, his level of sophistication in interacting with women, especially women who are above him in the social strata, is low. Any contact he has had with women he has found attractive would be described by these women as “awkward.” He might demonstrate an overt interest in certain women, complimenting them, etc., is an effort to get closer to them. However, he may misperceive the intentions of some women who are “nice” to

him because they don't want to hurt his feelings. His misperceptions might cause him to think there could be more to their "friendship" than what the women perceives.

- It is likely this offender spends a significant amount of time watching women and following those in whom he is interested. Whether he is at work, at a bar, on his days off, alone or with others, he watches women. At times, this behavior could be excessive and something he engages in to the exclusion of other daily activities. Watching women and following them would be exciting for him. When questioned about it, he would defend this behavior and attempt to normalize it by telling others "I just like women."
- This offender does not just follow women from a distance and it is possibly he will attempt to interact with them. He has interacted with other women in the Baton Rouge area that he has not killed. However, his low-key style would not have caused suspicion. What may draw attention to him is when his watching and following women becomes obviously inappropriate. He may be so intent on watching them, he can become almost oblivious when he "crosses the line," and they finally notice him or even confront him about it. Persons who know this offender would likely be aware of his behavior and probably have made comments to him about it. He would deny his behavior is inappropriate.
- Women who have been or will be questioned by investigators may not even think to mention this individual because he seems so harmless. The women he follows, watches, or interacts with may not even be aware of him because he "blends in" with the community and his physical appearance is normal. He may come across to some women as a "nice guy" who might have tried to get a little too close too soon, but otherwise is a non-threatening person. He may go out of his way to be helpful to women in an effort to get closer to them. This veneer of harmlessness is his shield of protection from suspicion.
- This is a person who will not handle rejection—real or imagined—well, particularly by women, and he will become angry, sullen, and determined to retaliate.
- There are behavioral aspects of each of the three assaults which are considered very high risk for the offender. This includes home intrusions at times when people are around, or could return home and find him. This high risk behavior exposes this offender to being identified or even apprehended. However, he does it anyway because it is probably enjoyable for him and adds to his sense of thrill and excitement. People who know this offender will recognize his propensity to engage in behavior which is high risk, to live on the edge—even in normal, everyday activities.
- This is an "impulsive" individual. When determined to do something, he disregards the consequences of his acts. However, his impulsivity should not be confused with lack of planning. This impulsivity has likely brought him to the attention of law enforcement in the past, even if for seemingly minor offenses, including trespassing, breaking

and entering, and peeping. His decision to attack each of the three women when he did may have been spontaneous or impulsive. However, because he had knowledge of these women's schedules and lifestyles, it would have lessened the "recklessness" of having made a spontaneous decision.

- The BAU believes that this offender lost control during the assault of Charlotte Murray Pace. Loosing control would have angered him. He does not like loosing control, and he would have been noticeably angry and agitated for sometime after the Pace homicide. People around him would have seen this agitation and will recall any disparaging remarks he might have made about Ms. Pace when her homicide was discussed—either by others or in the media. He would have appeared very interested in media reports following the homicide.
- If the offender was accountable for his time on the day Pace was murdered, and he had to return to his normal schedule, his distraction would have been very noticeable to others around him. However, if at all possible, he would not have returned to his normal schedule, and his absence from that schedule would have been noted by others.
- People who know this offender, know that he hates loosing control—even in everyday situations. But when he does, he becomes very agitated and upset—and blames other for what happens.
- This offender is determined and mission oriented. Even under stress he is able to complete his assaults on his victims—which was his intention when he entered their residences. This ability to be cool under pressure, is also a trait that those who know him have seen in the past. At times, when others are upset, and unable to function, he will appear unaffected and detached.
- This is a determined individual who likely became upset at certain times in the past twelve months since the death of Gina Green on Sunday, September 23, 2001. People who know him or were around him specifically during key critical times will be aware of his anger and would have seen his agitation. People should pay particular note of these times, which are outlined below.
 - (1) Following the death of Charlotte Murray Pace on Friday, May 31, 2002, this offender would have likely behaved in a very angry and agitated manner for a period of time. News reports and other mention of Ms. Pace and what happened to her would have precipitated his making particularly disparaging remarks about her, even blaming her for what happened.
 - (2) On July 10th, when it was made public that the Green and Pace homicides were connected through DNA, this offender would have again felt agitated and angry and seemed preoccupied. He might have asked those around him seemingly casual questions about the reliability of DNA analysis and how DNA is obtained. He would also make disparaging comments about law enforcement; for example, they were unable to solve these murders because whoever is responsible is too smart to get caught.

- (3) This offender did not want, nor did he expect for Pam Kinamore's body to be found. On Tuesday, July 16, 2002, when it was announced that her body was found—near the Whiskey Bay Exit off of Interstate 10, he would have been noticeably upset—agitated, angry, and preoccupied. Those around him may recall his having made comments that there was no way the Kinamore murder was connected to the other two.
- This offender may have even returned to the Whiskey Bay area—to scene where he left Kinamore's body—because he was so perplexed about her having been found. This return to that area may have appeared to have been for “legitimate” reasons, for example he was “curious” about what the area looked like.
 - This offender has followed this investigation in the media. His attention to the media reports would be inconsistent with his prior behavior about current events in Baton Rouge, in which he displayed little interest. On Friday, July 12, 2002, two days after the announcement of the Pace and Green murders were connected by DNA, Pam Kinamore is taken out of her home. It is likely this change in his MO is a direct result of his having learned about the Pace-Green connection through the media.
 - If involved in a relationship with a woman, or living with a female, (mother, sisters, etc.), he can become unpredictably moody, volatile and abusive. These women would know this side of him and be afraid of him. They would also likely describe him at times as being cold and without empathy.
 - This offender may have given “gifts” to women in his life—even at times when there was no apparent reason. These gifts could have been wrapped as though they were new, and may have seemed strange to the receiver, because they did not reflect personal “taste” or it was something they neither wanted nor needed.
 - This offender will be very interested in the release of the “profile” information today. While on the outside he may try to appear very disinterested, he will in fact feel very anxious that some of his own traits as identified by the FBI might make him suspicious to others.

Since the Kinamore homicide this offender has felt less anxious and concerned about being arrested. His level of confidence has increased over time and things have returned to “normal” for him. However, the release today of some of the offender's traits and characteristics will raise his anxiety level back up and also produce some paranoia in him. The offender now knows that he has made mistakes before, during and after the commission of these crimes, but he cannot go back in time and fix them. These mistakes make him vulnerable.

In addition to the mistakes he has made, this offender will likely to be very concerned about people around him who might suspect him. He will be concerned that once they read this profile they will recall specifically his agitation and anger at the critical times identified above. He will

wonder about comments he might have made in the past concerning these homicides and the victims, and to whom he made these comments. This paranoia will continue for a while, particularly since he does not know what the entire “profile” says about him, and he does not know what will happen next in the investigation as a result of the release of this information. If he is still in the Baton Rouge area he may be tempted to leave at this time—at least temporarily. However, he is concerned about how his absence would look to others.

Addendum

1. This offender will likely be concerned when and if law enforcement begins “to close in” on him. For example, if employed at a location where “scent evidence” had been discovered by the bloodhounds, he may remark about this evidence. These remarks will be disparaging ones such as, “*scent evidence*” is unreliable.
2. If this individual is employed with or affiliated with any “*scent evidence*” locations discovered by the bloodhounds, it is likely he will be interested in the investigation and will attempt to monitor it somehow. He will ask questions particularly of those people he knows he was around at the times indicated in the profile. However, this offender is also likely to find ways to separate himself—legitimately—from work. This could include taking vacation, sick leave, transferring, looking for a new job, or resigning without notice.

Trineisha Dene’ Colomb Homicide—Addendum

The following addendum is being provided to the original assessment which was released in September 2002. It is based on a review of information to date regarding the abduction and murder of Trineisha Dene Colomb. Should additional information become available, this addendum could change or be modified.

1. Trineisha Colomb’s vehicle was seen at approximately 1:30pm on Thursday November 21. Her vehicle, a black 1994 Mazda MX3 was parked, keys in the ignition, along Robbie Road in Grand Couteau. People were working and conducting normal business in this area during that period of time. As in the three other homicide cases, this is very high risk behavior for the offender. He could not control who saw him, who recorded his license plate number, or noted his description.
2. The offender drove with the victim in his vehicle for approximately thirty miles to a very specific location in Western Lafayette off of Renaud Drive.

Even though there were other locations much closer, the offender chose to “risk it” and drive the distance to the Renaud Drive location.

3. The area off of Renaud Drive is a residential, farming, and light industrial area. There are any number of people around during the day conducting normal business. It is also an area used by hunters and four wheel drivers. There would be a randomness to when someone

might be in this area, working or recreating. However, this offender felt comfortable enough in spite of this activity, to take Trineisha there. This offender is familiar with this specific location, and knew about it beforehand.

4. Triseisha's body is found approximately 250–300 yards off of the roadside in a moderately wooded area which is extremely muddy and difficult to traverse. It would have been difficult for him to walk this area while controlling the victim.
 - (a) The actual site where the attack occurred and where the victim was ultimately found provided concealment for him and emphasizes how well he knew this area. The offender did not want the victim's body to be found and made a concerted effort to prevent that from happening.
 - (b) His knowledge of this location comes from living, visiting, or working in this area.
5. On Sunday November 24th Trineisha Colomb's body was found, and on Monday December 23, it was announced that evidence was obtained to link her homicide through DNA to the other three victims in Baton Rouge. The offender would have been noticeably upset after these announcements. Those close to him, a friend or a relative, would have noted this behavior.
6. Because of the high risk and impulsive behavior seen in this crime this offender made mistakes which he cannot go back and fix. His only way of monitoring the progress of the investigation and asses the mistakes he made is to follow the media reports. People close to the offender would be aware that between November 21 and 24th, and again on December 23 when the announcement was made regarding the DNA, this person was paying very close attention to the news, might be out of character for him.
7. This crime occurred on a Thursday in the early afternoon. The offender probably was not accountable for his time on that date giving him the opportunity to complete the abduction and homicide. If he was accountable for his time, the person to whom he was accountable, would be aware of his unscheduled absence.
8. This offender has attacked women either in their homes, or, as in this case, outdoors, exposing himself to any number of risks. He took Pam Kinamore and Trineisha Columb to secondary locations after abducting them. These secondary locations were both outdoors and a significant distance from the abduction site. His selection of secondary sites may be based on the fact he lives with others and could not take the victim to his "comfort zone."

It is the opinion of the Behavioral Analysis Unit of the FBI that this offender lives with and/or works with other people who will recognize the following personality traits believed to be associated with him. The following behavioral traits should be considered in their totality.

- a. Impulsive—Acts suddenly and seemingly without thought or deliberation; tends to disregard the consequences for his behavior and actions.
- b. Angry—These attacks involve a very unique type of violence. It is an unprovoked violence. This tendency to act out aggressively toward someone, without any apparent reason, has been witnessed by others who live or work with him. He has likely been involved in any or all of the following: domestic abuse, workplace violence, random assaultive behavior, threatening behavior, etc. People who know this offender may be intimidated by him because of his erratic, spontaneous temper.
- c. Lack of empathy—There is an obvious disregard for these victims. This offender is concerned about being caught. His coldness and lack of regard for others would be noted in other areas of his life especially by family members who have been hurt by his lack of concern. His emotions are usually shallow and even inappropriate at times.
- d. “Following Behavior”—This offender has the ability to follow women and watch them while not being noticed or alerting them. When the opportunity presents itself, this person is prepared and willing to act out—in spite of many risks. He engages in this following behavior a great deal of time.
- e. Need for high risk—Thrill: These attacks, including the most recent one, contain a very distinct high risk aspect which is unnecessary to the commission of the crime. This suggests this offender may have a need for risk and thrill even in other areas of his life and he will engage in activities which satisfy this need.

Despite the FBI’s revisions and corrections, and the task force endorsement of it, the profile was wrong. At the outset, the FBI profiler’s assumed that since the victim’s were mostly white, then the offender was also most likely white. As Hustmyre (2005) explains:

In July 2002, the Baton Rouge Police Department hosted a meeting of local law enforcement investigators. The purpose of the meeting was to find out how many of their unsolved murders were linked to the person whom people were starting to call “the Baton Rouge serial killer.” Zachary [Police Department] detective [David] McDavid attended the meeting.

He presented three cases to the group: the murder of Connie Warner, the abduction of Randi Mebruror and the attack on the couple in the cemetery. McDavid told the group of law-enforcement professionals that he and Mixon were looking closely at a man named [Derrick Todd] Lee. The lead agencies, the Baton Rouge Police Department and the East Baton Rouge Sheriffs Office, disagreed. According to the FBI profile, they believed the serial killer to be a white male. And since Lee was black, that was the end of the story. The Baton Rouge agencies formed a task force to hunt down the serial killer, but they didn’t invite the small Zachary Police Department to participate. “It bothered us,” McDavid admits. The newly formed task force began taking DNA samples from hundreds—eventually thousands—of white males.

Unfortunately, FBI profilers also relied heavily on the homology assumption, described in Chapter 20. That assumption proved incorrect; traits evident at the scene were not evident in the offender's everyday life. In fact, the opposite was true.

FBI profiler Mary Ellen O'Toole suggested that these killings were the work of a white male, between 25 and 35, who was a social outcast, was "unsophisticated," did not get along well with women, was "awkward" socially around women, was "impulsive"/quick to temper and looking to "retaliate," and would have "bragged" to friends and coworkers about nonexistent relationships. If in a relationship, he would be abusive and cold.

Derrick Todd Lee was, in fact, described as a religious 34-year-old black male with an ex-wife and two kids who was also known as smooth, handsome, and charming. He was also described as an outgoing "Casanova," who frequented the bars in St. Francisville and Solitude, wearing a cowboy hat, snakeskin boots, and with a different girlfriend every night. He lived with a girlfriend while separated from his wife, but he did not move from the area (Naanes, 2003).⁴

REFERENCES

- Alison, L. (2005) *The Forensic Psychologists Casebook: Psychological Profiling and Criminal Investigation*, Portland, OR: Willan.
- Billiot, T. (2002) "Expert: Killer Could Strike Anywhere along I-10," *The Advocate*, December 24.
- Hustmyre, C. (2005) "The Hunch Bunch," *New Orleans Magazine*, June 1, 39(9).
- Naanes, M. (2003) "The Two Sides of Derrick Todd Lee," *The Advocate*, June 22.
- Noel, J. (2003) "Serial Killer Hunt Described: Other Police Agencies Interested in Techniques," *Baton Rouge Advocate*, November 4.
- Savidge, M., and Harris, A. (2003) "Suspected Louisiana Serial Killer Arrives in Baton Rouge," *CNN*, May 28.
- Shannon Kohler v. Pat Englade*; Elmer Litchfield; Christopher Johnson; City of Baton Rouge; Parish of East Baton Rouge, (2006) United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, Case No. 05-30541, November 21.

⁴The author was contacted by the media about this case several times and given access to case material that had been made available to the media though not necessarily released to the public in its entirety. Based on an examination of that material, the author gave the following statement to the press, among others (Billiot, 2002):

Based on what he knows about the case, Turvey said these crimes are probably not the first for the serial killer. He said authorities are surely checking all unsolved and solved burglaries and sexual assaults along I-10.

Derrick Todd Lee had in fact been arrested in November 1992 for burglary and was arrested again in July 1997 for burglary, criminal trespassing, and two counts of being a peeping Tom.

