

## Letters from Judge Heaney, Eighth Circuit Court

- 1991: Letter from Judge Heaney endorsing a commutation of Peltier's sentence. Judge Heaney denied Peltier a new trial in 1986.
  - 2000: Letter from Judge Heaney affirming his 1991 letter.
- 

### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Chambers of  
Gerald W. Heaney  
United States Senior Circuit Judge  
Federal Building  
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

April 18, 1991

Senator Daniel K. Inouye  
United States Senate  
Select Committee on Indian Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20510-6450

Re: Leonard Peltier

Dear Senator Inouye:

Unfortunately I did not receive your letter of February 1, 1991 until April 13, 1991. When I did receive your letter, I was visiting your state. Thus, this is my first chance to reply.

As you know, I wrote the opinion in United States v. Peltier, 800 F.2d 772 (8th Cir. 1986), and I sat as a member of the court in an earlier appeal, United States v. Peltier, 731 F.2d 550 (8th Cir. 1984). In the case I authored, our court concluded:

There is a possibility that the jury would have acquitted Leonard Peltier had the records and data improperly withheld from the defense been available to him in order to better exploit and reinforce the inconsistencies casting strong doubts upon the government's case. Yet, we are bound by the Bagley test requiring that we be convinced, from a review of the entire record, that had the data and records withheld been made available, the jury probably would have reached a different result. We have not been so convinced.

United States v. Peltier, 731 F.2d at 779-80. No new evidence has been called to my attention which would cause me to change the conclusion reached in that case.

There are, however, other aspects of the case that the President may see fit to consider in determining whether he should take action to commute or otherwise mitigate the sentence of Leonard Peltier. My thoughts on these other aspects result from a very careful study of the records of the Peltier trial and the post-trial evidence and from a study of the record in the Robideaux-

Butler trial before Judge McManus in Iowa, a trial which resulted in the acquittal of Robideaux and Butler.

First, the United States government over-reacted at Wounded Knee. Instead of carefully considering the legitimate grievances of the Native Americans, the response was essentially a military one which culminated in a deadly firefight on June 26, 1975 between the Native Americans and the FBI agents and the United States marshals.

Second, the United States government must share the responsibility with the Native Americans for the June 26 firefight. It was an intense one in which both government agents and Native Americans were killed. While the government's role in escalating the conflict into a firefight cannot serve as a legal justification for the killing of the FBI agents at short range, it can properly be considered a mitigating circumstance.

Third, the record persuades me that more than one person was involved in the shooting of the FBI agents. Again, this fact is not a legal justification for Peltier's actions, but it is a mitigating circumstance.

Fourth, the FBI used improper tactics in securing Peltier's extradition from Canada and in otherwise investigating and trying the Peltier case. Although out court decided that these actions were not grounds for reversal, they are, in my view, factors that merit consideration in any petition for leniency filed.

Fifth, Leonard Peltier was tried, found guilty, and sentenced. He has now served more than fourteen years in the federal penitentiary. At some point, a healing process must begin. We as a nation must treat Native Americans more fairly. To do so, we must recognize their unique culture and their great contributions to our nation. Favorable action by the President in the Leonard Peltier case would be an important step in this regard. I recognize that this decision lies solely within the President's discretion. I simply state my view based on the record presented to our court. I authorize you to show this letter to the President if you desire to do so.

Again, I am sorry your letter was not delivered to me at earlier date.

Sincerely,

(signature)

GERALD W. HEANEY

GWH:bn

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

CHAMBERS OF  
GERALD W. HEANEY  
UNITED STATES SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE  
FEDERAL BUILDING  
DULUTH, MINNESOTA 55802

April 18, 1991

Senator Daniel K. Inouye  
United States Senate  
Select Committee on Indian Affairs  
Washington, D.C. 20510-6450

Re: Leonard Peltier

Dear Senator Inouye:

Unfortunately I did not receive your letter of February 1, 1991 until April 13, 1991. When I did receive your letter, I was visiting your state. Thus, this is my first chance to reply.

As you know, I wrote the opinion in United States v. Peltier, 800 F.2d 772 (8th Cir. 1986), and I sat as a member of the court in an earlier appeal, United States v. Peltier, 731 F.2d 550 (8th Cir. 1984). In the case I authored, our court concluded:

There is a possibility that the jury would have acquitted Leonard Peltier had the records and data improperly withheld from the defense been available to him in order to better exploit and reinforce the inconsistencies casting strong doubts upon the government's case. Yet, we are bound by the Bagley test requiring that we be convinced, from a review of the entire record, that had the data and records withheld been made available, the jury probably would have reached a different result. We have not been so convinced.

United States v. Peltier, 731 F.2d at 779-80. No new evidence has been called to my attention which would cause me to change the conclusion reached in that case.

There are, however, other aspects of the case that the President may see fit to consider in determining whether he should take action to commute or otherwise mitigate the sentence of Leonard Peltier. My thoughts on these other aspects result from a very careful study of the records of the Peltier trial and the post-trial evidence and from a study of the record in the Robideaux-Butler trial before Judge McManus in Iowa, a trial which resulted in the acquittal of Robideaux and Butler.

First, the United States government over-reacted at Wounded Knee. Instead of carefully considering the legitimate grievances of the Native Americans, the response was essentially a military one which culminated in a deadly firefight on June 26, 1975 between the Native Americans and the FBI agents and the United States marshals.

Second, the United States government must share the responsibility with the Native Americans for the June 26 firefight. It was an intense one in which both government agents and Native Americans were killed. While the government's role in escalating the conflict into a firefight cannot serve as a legal justification for the killing of the FBI agents at short range, it can properly be considered as a mitigating circumstance.

Third, the record persuades me that more than one person was involved in the shooting of the FBI agents. Again, this fact is not a legal justification for Peltier's actions, but it is a mitigating circumstance.

Fourth, the FBI used improper tactics in securing Peltier's extradition from Canada and in otherwise investigating and trying the Peltier case. Although our court decided that these actions were not grounds for reversal, they are, in my view, factors that merit consideration in any petition for leniency filed.

Fifth, Leonard Peltier was tried, found guilty, and sentenced. He has now served more than fourteen years in the federal penitentiary. At some point, a healing process must begin. We as a nation must treat Native Americans more fairly. To do so, we must recognize their unique culture and their great contributions to our nation. Favorable action by the President in the Leonard Peltier case would be an important step in this regard. I recognize that this decision lies solely within the President's discretion. I simply state my view based on the record presented to our court. I authorize you to show this letter to the President if you desire to do so.

Again, I am sorry your letter was not delivered to me at an earlier date.

Sincerely,

GERALD W. HEANEY