Prosecutors Told to Keep All Evidence

Sanford J. Ungar Washington Post Staff Writer

The U.S. Court of Appeals, asserting that criminal trials must be "more a quest for ruth than a sporting event," ordered government prosecuors and investigators yesterlay to preserve all evidence that might potentially be useful to defendants.

Filing a harshly worded opinion by Judge J. Skelly Wright, the court complained of "a dark no-man's-land of unreviewed bureaucratic and discretionary decision making" that endangers the rights of those on trial.

In sharp contrast to the "carefully safeguarded fairness of the courtroom," he said, pretrial procedures often involve the destruction or "loss" of evidence subject to full disclosure.

"Too often, what the process purports to secure in its formal stages can be subverted or diluted in its more informal stages," Wright wrote at the beginning of a 21-page opin-

Joined by Judge Carl Mc-Gowan, he called upon federal investigative agencies such as the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to formulate "rules, systematically applied and systematically enforced . . . for preserving evidence."

The opinion came on an appeal of the conviction of two men, Carlton E. Bryant and William E. Turner, for their alleged part in the sale of a large quantity of heroin at a Washington motel.

See EVIDENCE, A6, Col. 1

Judge Wright Rules Prosecutors Must Keep Evidence Until Trial

EVIDENCE, From A1

They were convicted in U.S. District Court, primarily on the basis of testimony by a bureau undercover agent who said he bought the heroin guilt or innocence." while his colleagues eavesdropped from an adjoining room.

At issue in the case was a tape recording of the transaction, never made available to the government prosecutor or defense lawyers and, according to the bureau, "lost" before the case ever came to trial.

Relying solely on its agents' recollections, the investigative agency took the position that the tape recording was not essential for the trial. For months, it refused to admit the existence of the tape.

'Court in Dark'

dark." Wright complained. "We have no idea what may have been on the tape. For all we know, the tape would have corroborated (the agent's) story perfectly; or, for all we know, it might have completely undercut the government's case."

"What we do know," the politan police department, conversations recorded on the ord-keeping practices." tape were absolutely crucial to the question of (the men's)

the prosecutor had the tape Service. recording available to him.

Case Remanedd

is not the most important fact; suppression of evidence by investigative officials, no less rupts the truth-seeking func- laws. tion of the trial," Wright said.

The opinion stopped short of reversing the conviction, but remanded the case to District Court for further inquiry into "the degree of negligence. "We are entirely in the and possibly of bad faith, involved" in the bureau's loss of the tape.

judge continued, "is that the which "has pretty good rec-

It could have a substantial impact, however, on federal investigative services head-He also scolded District quartered here, such as the Judge Leonard P. Walsh for FBI, BNDD, and the Alcohol, ruling during the trial that the Tabacco and Firearms Divi-'important fact" was whether sion of the Internal Revenue

Issue in Drug Trial

Recently, the availability of "It should be clear that that internal documents, reports and notes became an issue in the trial of six men in District Court on charges of conspirthan by the prosecution, cor- acy to violate federal narcotics

> Defense lawyers in that case repeatedly questioned the ability of narcotics bureau agents to remember accurately details of investigations they had conducted more than a year earlier.

The agent most severely criticized in yesterday's opin-A source in the U.S. attor-ion, who supervised the surney's office said yesterday veillance and tape recording that the opinion was likely to of the transaction, also testihave little effect on the metro- fied in the conspiracy case.