

STATE OF MINNESOTA)

)

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

AFFIDAVIT OF RAVI SEELEY

I, Ravi Seeley, under penalty of perjury, state as follows:

1. On August 29, 2005, I testified as a witness for the prosecution in the criminal case of Marvin Haynes, Jr.

2. I became involved in this case because I was walking nearby Jerry's Flower Shop in Minneapolis when Harry Sherer was killed on May 16, 2004. I was 14 years old at the time. I heard a gunshot and saw a man run out of the flower shop. I eventually spoke with officers from Minneapolis Police Department and told them what I had seen.

3. On May 19, 2004, one or more police officers spoke with me about the case. At some point they showed me a photo lineup. I identified one of the individuals in the lineup as the person I thought I may have seen running from the flower store. The individual whose photo I identified was Marvin Haynes. After I initially indicated I thought it might be that photo, I remember feeling like the officer wanted me to stick with that selection. He emphasized how important it was to solve this crime and put a dangerous criminal away.

4. The next day, on May 20, 2004, the police brought me in to view an in-person lineup. I again identified one of the individuals in the lineup as the person I may have seen. The individual I Identified was Marvin Haynes.

5. While I do not have a clear memory of my trial testimony, I know from the transcript that I said that I had doubts about both of the identifications I made and that I

had expressed doubts at the time of the in-person lineup to one of the officers who was present. That was true.

6. What I did not say at trial, but what is also true, is that I felt the police officers pressured me to make an identification both times around. The officers led me to believe this person was dangerous, that I needed to help them solve the case, and that I could get in trouble if I was not helpful. In fact, I did not get a clear view of the face of the person running from the flower shop. Only 14 years old, I had never been interviewed by police or been involved with anything like this. I was terrified about what could happen to me if I was not cooperative. That same fear is the reason I did not provide these additional details during my trial testimony. I worried that if I did, I could get in trouble.

7. To this day, I have no confidence in the identifications I made back in 2004. Being able to look at these events from the perspective of an adult, I believe that, as a young and impressionable teenager, the police officers pressured me into making potentially inaccurate identifications and telling the officers what I believed they wanted to hear.

I declare under penalty of perjury that everything I have stated in this document is true and correct.

FURTHER YOUR AFFIANT SAITH NOT,



Ravi Seeley

Subscribed and sworn to
before me
this 11 day of October, 2022.



Notary Public

