

PRESS RELEASE

For immediate release

Contact: Jenny Holtzclaw

Holtzclaw statement on Demetria Campbell settlement

Enid, Oklahoma (March 27, 2019)

Taxpayers should be outraged by Oklahoma City's cowardly payoff to an opportunist exploiting our son and brother's wrongful convictions. Demetria Campbell and her lawyers came forward only after the unjust verdicts in Daniel's case to cash in on phony claims of excessive use of force and improper conduct that allegedly occurred in 2013, in response to a 911 call over a stolen vehicle. The city's own descriptions of Campbell's claims include "**outrageous,**" "**opportunistic,**" and "**too inconsistent to be true**" -- descriptions that also fit all of the accusers that prosecutors brought to the 2015 trial that led to Daniel's unconscionable imprisonment for crimes of which he is 100 percent innocent.

This type of litigation blackmail is an affront to true justice and will impose huge costs to the public in the long run. All conscientious police officers should also be alarmed. Oklahoma City has given a new greenlight to false accusers to fabricate claims against cops months and years after uneventful encounters.

Here are the facts that you haven't read about in the media:

- Daniel conducted himself in a thoroughly professional manner throughout the stop on Nov. 3, 2013, when a citizen reported a stolen vehicle via 911. When Campbell, who matched the suspect's description, attempted to leave the scene, Daniel tracked her inside a restaurant, took her outside, and handcuffed her while using a brick wall as leverage to safely take the woman, whose weight was large, into custody while on solo patrol.
- During a deposition under oath, **Campbell admitted that Daniel did not use excessive force.** On Feb. 15, 2018, she testified that while speaking with Daniel's supervisor, Lt. Brian Bennett: "I did not tell him that I thought he [Holtzclaw] used unnecessary force." (p. 178). She admitted that Daniel apologized for having to handle her physically and that she told him: "I'll forgive you." (p. 193)

- In its motion for summary judgment, the city itself repeatedly blasted Campbell for her expedient tall tales and lack of credibility:
 - “...it is important to note that Plaintiff Campbell has suffered no wrong, intentionally or negligently” (p. 9)
 - “...there are numerous inconsistencies in Plaintiff Campbell’s multiple versions of the events...Defendant City asserts that Plaintiff Campbell’s claims are **too inconsistent to be true and are merely the product of an opportunity to piggyback** onto the claims of certain individuals" who made allegations that led to the criminal trial. (p. 11)
 - “Other inconsistencies that **diminish Plaintiff Campbell’s credibility** include the fact that she claimed to have read her medical records prior to the deposition, yet was unable to remember if she had been given a pain medicine prescription...” (p. 12)
 - “Probably the most **outrageous** portion of Plaintiff Campbell’s testimony is that she was able to tell that Defendant Holtzclaw had an erection and placed it against her butt for two minutes. **This claim did not conveniently surface until nearly a year after the Oklahoma County District Attorney filed charges against Defendant Holtzclaw.**” (p. 12)
 - “During her deposition, Plaintiff Campbell generalized that Defendant Holtzclaw was ‘perverted,’ had an erection during the encounter, and pressed the alleged erection against her butt for approximately two minutes after he had already handcuffed her...This claim is **simply fantastic** considering Plaintiff Campbell is only 5’3” and Defendant Holtzclaw is 6’2”, and the amount of equipment police officers carry on their service belt while on duty. When asked how she could tell she felt an erection as opposed to a firearm, Plaintiff Campbell was oddly confident that she could tell what was pressed against her, even considering the hectic nature of the encounter.” (p. 13)
 - “The fact that she now wants to change the narrative to fit the new allegation is telling of the **opportunistic nature of this claim** and severely cuts against her credibility.” (p. 13)

- The city further asserted in reply to the plaintiff’s response to city’s motion for summary judgment:
 - “Simply put, the Plaintiff’s **version of the events has changed every time** between her interview with Lieutenant Bennett, her initial tort claim, her petition in the instant case, her response to Defendant City’s discovery requests, her deposition, and her response to defendant city’s motion for summary judgement.

The Plaintiff should not be allowed to constantly change her version of the events to create a dispute of a material fact...” (p. 3)

Just to make the city’s position absolutely clear: They argued in their Campbell case filings that accusers are not credible if their accusations change dramatically over time, contain myriad inconsistencies, and are lodged to "piggyback" off of other complaints in the wake of news coverage and publicity. The City viewed Ms. Campbell as an opportunist who sued simply to enrich herself. The City alleged that her accusations were so flagrantly and obviously false that she should not even be given her day in Court.

Yet, taxpayers will now foot a \$25,000 bill to make her go away.

Just to make our position absolutely clear: Daniel is an innocent man who was wrongly convicted based on fatally flawed forensic evidence, a biased and incompetent police investigation, and prosecutorial misconduct. The forensic science errors, unchallenged by Daniel's trial attorney, culminated in Daniel's wrongful conviction on 18 out of 36 counts after the prosecutor flagrantly misrepresented a minute quantity of DNA on the fly of Daniel's uniform pants as deriving from vaginal fluid although no body fluids were detected and non-intimate DNA transfer explained the evidence. The grave injustices suffered by our son and brother have now been compounded by the city’s payoff to an individual who is opportunistically piggybacking off Daniel’s suffering.

We continue to await a decision by the Court of Criminal Appeals on Daniel’s appeal, and hope and pray the judges will come to the same conclusion that six internationally-renowned scientists did (www.HoltzclawDNAreport.com) when they reviewed the forensic errors and biased police investigation in this case:

Daniel deserves a new trial.