

## **Errata and Corrections**

While we strive for accuracy, we sometimes make mistakes. This section is to set the record straight for when we don't get it right. Because documents submitted to the Judiciary Committee are part of the official record, we can't change the originals on our end to make corrections, as such changes would not be reflected in the record and would alter the original documents. Thus, the original documents are posted on the website and all corrections will be compiled here.

1. PCI's Feb. 20, 2008 Response to Mr. Puryear's testimony stated, "There was no basis in fact for Mr. Puryear's conjecture that CPR may have caused the four broken ribs suffered by Ms. Richardson, based upon the statement from Dr. Bruce Levy and the attached autopsy report; nor was there any basis in law, as CPR was not raised as a defense or explanation in the pleadings filed in the civil lawsuit. ..." Although that statement was partly correct, it was not completely correct. Review of all the documents on the PACER federal court docket system, and a review of the original Estelle Richardson lawsuit case file (which was pulled from archives and viewed at the U.S. District Court in Nashville), found that CPR had not been raised or mentioned by any of the defendants in the case, including CCA. Two attorneys in the case, contacted by phone, said they were unaware that CPR had been raised as an explanation for the broken ribs. At the time that PCI's Response was submitted, it was not known that CCA's paid medical expert, Dr. William McCormick, in a report that was never entered in the case file, had opined that Estelle Richardson's broken ribs may have been caused by CPR. Mr. Puryear, who was evidently aware of Dr. McCormick's report, apparently relied on it when he made his statement. Dr. Bruce Levy, the State Medical Examiner who personally conducted Ms. Richardson's autopsy, has strongly disputed Dr. McCormick's conclusion as to the cause of Ms. Richardson's broken ribs.

2. PCI's Feb. 20, 2008 Response to Mr. Puryear's testimony stated, relative to an "after action report" involving a hostage-taking and shooting at the CCA-operated Bay County Jail, that Mr. Puryear had indicated CCA was responsive to requests for such reports. This statement was based on a party who had attended Mr. Puryear's Feb. 12 hearing in person and had relayed that information. The transcript of the hearing still is not available. We have since been told that Mr. Puryear limited his remarks by stating CCA provides such reports to contracting agencies that request them (not to the general public or to PCI specifically). Although PCI did not claim in its Response that Mr. Puryear had said CCA would provide such reports to PCI specifically, this point needs clarification to accurately reflect Mr. Puryear's remarks. PCI's request for the after action report was denied due to attorney-client privilege, according to a CCA attorney.

3. In regard to Mr. Puryear's potential conflicts of interest, PCI has consistently maintained that Mr. Puryear would have had conflicts of interest in more than 400 cases (most likely much higher, but we stopped counting at 400). The Alliance for Justice and AFSCME, in their letters of opposition to Mr. Puryear's nomination, incorrectly said there were 400+ such cases since 2000. Although this wasn't a mistake on PCI's part, we noted this error in our Feb. 20 Response to Mr. Puryear's testimony, and repeat it here for clarification.