which is approximately a thirty-two inch windowsill, and approximately one inch from the side. Whether that's the front side or the rear side. I am not sure. It is the side opposite the painting, and, therefore. I would assume that it was the outside; though this is something that I couldn't determine without matching nailholes in the windowsill to the actual window casing.
Q. First, did you examine it microscopically?
A. Yes; with a Spero Binocular microscope.
Q. Were you able to form an opinion as to whether or not the indentation in the windowsill contained sufficient detail to determine the nature of the object that made it?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. What was your opinion?
A. Using several cross-lightings to highlight this, it was possible to detect the indentations and ridges that might result from tool work, such as chisel marks, something of this kind, but $I$ could not find sufficient detail to indicate general characteristics, let alone individual characteristics, and based upon the examination I conducted, I do not believe it possible to determine even the class of the object that made that indentation, let alone a specific or positive identity of that object.
Q. At the guilty plea hearing March 10th, 1968, it was stated that Mr. Robert A. Frazier, of the FBI, examined the
windowsill, and I will read you a single paragraph which, Your Honor, comes at pages 96 and 97 of the Otwell transcript, quoting -- "That he also made microscopic comparison between the fresh dent in the sill of the window at the bathroom, $422 \frac{1}{2}$ South Main, and concluded that the microscopic evidence in this dent was consistent in all ways with the same microscopic marks that appear on the barrel of this rifle; 30.06 rifle."

Could we have your comments on that conclusion by Mr. Frazier?
A. Well, I don't think it is possible to make a microscopic comparison of the machine marks on the barrel, which from this cut would have to be the muzzle to it, that would be the only portion of the barrel that would be capable of making such a clean, fine cut. It certainly couldn't be made further back from the muzzle toward the stock, and there just isn't enough detail there to make that examination in raw weather wood and conclude that a positive identification could be made: so I disagree with that.
Q. If I understand you correctly, you say if it could be made by the gun at all, in your opinion it would have to be made by the muzzle being rested on the windowsill and not the barrel further aft?
A. That's the only ninety-degree portion of the barrel that is exposed that could allow such a dent or cut to be
made. So if it was made with the barrel, it wasn't with the circumference or the periphery of the barrel. It. would have to be made with the muzzle or possibly the front. sight. Q. If it had been the muzzle or the front sight, would there have been other markings on the windowsill?
A. Not necessarily. It could havebeen just bumped or hit in a rather awkward configuration.
Q. Suppose the gun was fired with the muzzle resting there? What would have been the result?
A. Wall, it would have torn up the windowsill. If the bullet itself or the projectile did not track the barrel. the muzzle blast would have left indelible markings that would have been very evident.
Q. Did you find such markings?
A. None whatever.
Q. And you say that you cannot match up that indentation with any part of the record?
A. No, I could not. For two reasons -- not only the lack of individual characteristics or fenestral characteristics. but the spacial relationship of the window and the geometric location of the windowsill preclude that instrument, at a nominal length of forty-two inches, fitting in the available space with the angle of that mark. Maybe I could diagram that and make it more simple.

MR. FENSTERWALD: I think it would be.

THE COURT: All right. There is a grease pencil over there, please.

THE WITNESS: The windowsill is approximately thirty-two inches in its longest dimension, approximately thirty-one and three-quarters, and at approximately the center, which is sixteen inches and a quarter, and at the beginning of this measurement of sixteen and a quarter is a seven millimeter long cut, and the cut is outlined in chalk, which I will indicate the chalk in red, and approximately fifteen inches to the other end, and the length of this (indicating) is approximately, therefore, a halfinch. This dimension is five inches, and the thickness is one inch (indicating). Not having a protractor I simply placed two rulers along here to determine the angle, which could be easily determined from the markings. This is three inch by five and one-quarter inches (indicating) -I will say, approximately, because without a drafting board, it is not possible to make measurements to a hundredths of an inch, of course. Nonetheless, this well defines the angle of the markings. the cut. The photograph. Exhibit 106, shows the windowsill approximately eighty-eight, eighty-nine millimeters, and by simply scaling that up into
five to six millimeters on the photograph to the wall. I -- I don't know which wall it is. I will call it the wall to the left of the window behind the bathtub. I don't know the direction. That makes this approximately one point eight inches. We will call it two inches to be generous. Projecting back in a straight line from this mark at the angle and perpendicular, normal or ninety degrees to the marking, which would, of course, be the only way that a cut could be made if it were, in fact, made with the barrel, as I believe the affidavit states, and not being possibly made with the curved area or the circumference of the barrel, and this then projects back in a straight line looking directly down on it, to be thirtytwo inches, and I would then be very liberal and put plus or minus ten percent, or let's say four inches in round figures.

Now, recognizing the fact that if the windowsill in cross section, had the barrel really gone on it -the barrel B -- A in the lower right, and this B, and then any point of impact would have to result. only if the barrel were tipped at some angle, indicated by the dotted line, and the line circled "A" before that cut could be made, and recognizing
further that as one brings up the barrel along the wall, the dimensior increases, I simply -perhaps I should go to another sheet. I simply took the thirty-two inches in the horizontal, in the available space between the marking and the wall. and projected it up to that point, that would allow forty-two inches, which is the length of the Model 760 Game Master Remington rifle, and it approximates a height of twenty-six inches. Again, to be liberal, I will say plus or minus four inches, because I do not have archectural drawings and protractors to work with. But this type of measurement should be, and I would presume already had been made, to just determine how can a weapon fit into the available space to make that cut, and that is the only possible configuration. If indeed the marking is on the outside of the window, as I have indicated the paint in the room in the first diagram, then wherefore the window itself would be -- it would intercept, since the marking is out further like that, and there has to be an interception there, and perhaps that would explain how it was caused, if the window stuck and someone put it in there and pried it up, but that would certainly leave another marking on the window. But just a matter
of whether or not it can fit the available space and if it is tipped up at something approximating thirty to forty-five degrees, that's the only way it would fit if the stock or butt plate were against the wall.

Going back to the windowsill, if we reversed the windowsill, because I am not certain which is inside and which is outside, as I previously stated, then that would put the mark even closer to the wall and inside so that the distance -- that it shifted to the left, from fifteen, rather from sixteen and a quarter to fifteen inches, and it would have shifted to the inside and make it even a shorter distance. This distance, of course, is shorter than that distance -- the red is shorter than the black (indicating throughout).

So, in other words, by proportioning up from the photograph to determine the distance of the windowsill edge to the wall, there is a maximum distance available, and if a forty-two inch weapon will not fit into it, then there is no possible way it could have been the marking from the muzzle end, which is the only one, in my opinion, that could have made it.
Q. Do you know the approximate angle at which the bullet
would have to travel from that window to the target, downward angle?
A. You mean in the actual shooting?
Q. If it was fired from there and hit Dr. King on the balcony.
A. Not of my own knowledge. I have seen a diagram that indicates the distance from the horizontal, the windowsill to the position that $\mathrm{Dr}_{\mathrm{r}}$. King was standing is not much of a drop, as I recall, which means that it would be a very slight downward angle.

MR. FENSTERWALD: Your Honor, from Yesterday's
testimony. I think the record will reveal that it
is approximately four degrees.
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. FENSTERWALD:
Q. In your diagram there you would indicate that the butt of the gun, if fired at a flat angle or four-degree angle or something of that nature, would be back through the wall?
A. Yes. It would stick in the wall about as much as ten inches. It just won't fit.
Q. And that doesn't account for somebody trying to hold the rifle and firing it at the same time?
A. No. That would be just sticking it in the corner and not using the sights or anything.
Q. Well, could you hit a target at two hundred feet that
way?
A. I think you could hit it. But you wouldn't know you were going to. It would be pure accident.
Q. Purely by accident?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar in detail with the 760 Game Master rifle?
A. No, I am not; not particulary. I have some of the 722 's and Model 700's, but not the 760 itself.
O. How can you say there is nothing on the bottom of the barrel that would leave a mark?
A. I have seen photographs of it, and catalogue advertisements, and I see nothing that would be there. Very few weapons like that would have a strap, and the leather strap is on the curved nature of the swivel strap holder, and would not produce that kind of cut. Now, if it were not the barrel, it seems to me whoever made the comparison would write up that it was something else. They would say swivel strap or fore-piece, front end, or something, or say sight even.
Q. Would a marksman rest the barrel of the rifle on the sill, or would he cushion it with something flexible such as his hand?

MR. HAILE: I object to that. If he wants to qualify him as a marksman --

THE COURT: (Interposing) I sustain the objection.

MR. HAILE: Or if he wants to qualify Mr. Ray as a marksman.

THE COURT: I sustained the objection, Mr. Haile. Go ahead.

MR. FENSTERWALD: Thank you.
Q. Mr. MacDonell. I would like to return to the question of the bullet and bullet fragments. Did you examine the large part of the bullet that was removed from the body of Dr. King?
A. Yes. I did.
Q. Could you describe in as much detail as possible its size, shape and distortion?
A. Well, it is a mushroom jacketed projectile, bullet, which has lost the lead core through mechanical disruption or impact. The casing or jacket, as it is accurately called, the jacket exhibits excellent striations. There are six righthand rifle grooves. The width and all the dimensions $I$ have here are consistent with a 30.06, and in my indexing or assigning values to land and groove, I arbitrarily took this as rifle groove No. 1, to correspond to the foldad over line, which Q-64 RF is inscribed on the inside of the jacket where it is folded over, and I arbitrarily took that as No. 1. Looking at the base and going in a clockwise fashion, there

