

- II. Appellant's federal and state due process rights were violated when Bullard and Trent were allowed to testify to alleged hearsay statements made to them by the alleged victims, in violation of Appellant's federal constitutional confrontation rights as re-defined by *Crawford v. Washington*.
- III. The State's witnesses improperly vouched for the credibility of W.C.'s and A.C.'s alleged incrimination of their father.
- IV. The trial court erroneously excluded Defense Exhibit 1, the letter from Dr. Brock concerning his finding, while at the same time admitting State's exhibits about other experts' findings.

After a thorough consideration of these propositions and the entire record before us on appeal including the original record, transcripts, and briefs of the parties, we have determined that error raised in Proposition II warrants reversal of the convictions and remand for a new trial.

In Proposition II, considered in light of *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 124 S.Ct. 1354, 158 L.Ed.2d 177 (2004), we find the admission of the child victims hearsay statements through prosecution witnesses Trent and Bullard, when the child victims do not testify in person during the trial, violated Appellant's rights under the Confrontation Clause. Both witnesses were trained workers in the field of child abuse and interviewed the victims as part of the investigation into possible criminal conduct committed by Appellant. Any incriminating statements would be used in Appellant's prosecution. While neither witness was a police officer, their roles in this case were similar to the role of a police officer in the investigation of a criminal case. As such admission of hearsay statements by the non-testifying victims violated Appellant's right to confront his accusers. While subject to a harmless error analysis, this

confrontation clause violation was not harmless error. *Conover v. State*, 1997 OK CR 6, ¶ 80, 933 P.2d 904, 923. Considered in light of the other evidence presented at trial, including the victim's initial naming of someone other than Appellant as the perpetrator and a subsequent recantation of the allegation against Appellant, there is a reasonable probability the victims' hearsay statements might have contributed to the conviction. Therefore, the conviction is reversed and the case remanded for a new trial.

DECISION

The Judgment and Sentence is **REVERSED and REMANDED FOR A NEW TRIAL.** Pursuant to Rule 3.15, *Rules of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals*, Title 22, Ch.18, App. (2005), the **MANDATE** is **ORDERED** issued upon delivery and filing of this decision.

AN APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY
THE HONORABLE WILLARD DRIESEL, DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES AT TRIAL

JAMES T. ROWAN
228 ROBERT S. KERR, STE. 615
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102, PL.
COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

JAMES THORNLEY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
EMILY REDMAN
JULIE NAIFEH
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS
117 N. THIRD ST.
DURANT, OK 74701
COUNSEL FOR THE STATE

APPEARANCES ON APPEAL

STEVEN N. PRESSON
207 W. MAIN ST.
P.O. BOX 5392
NORMAN, OK 73070
COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

W.A. DREW EDMONDSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA
WILLIAM R. HOLMES
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
112 STATE CAPITOL
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105
COUNSEL FOR THE STATE

OPINION BY: LUMPKIN, V.P.J.

CHAPEL, P.J.: CONCUR

C. JOHNSON, J.: CONCUR

A. JOHNSON, J.: CONCUR

LEWIS, J.: CONCUR

RC