

RONNIE L. KIMBLE 0628799
ODOM CORR INST
Route 1 Box 34
JACKSON N. CAROLINA 27345

JUNE 8 - 2000

MR JOHN B. HATFIELD JR, ATTORNEY AT LAW
HATFIELD AND HATFIELD
219 W. WASHINGTON STREET
GREENSBORO, N. CAROLINA 27401

RE: Reply to Letter with Documents

DEAR MR. HATFIELD:

I RECEIVED YOUR LETTER DATED MAY 8 WITH ENCLOSED COPIES OF SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS I REQUESTED. I'D LIKE TO EXPRESS MY GRATITUDE FOR YOUR EFFORT IN COOPERATING WITH MY REQUEST.

PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS (AS IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN) MY DESIRE TO HAVE YOUR COOPERATION. AS IN ALL RELATIONSHIPS - THE ATTORNEY/CLIENT RELATIONSHIP IS NOT A ONE WAY STREET, AND REQUIRES MUTUAL COOPERATION AND RESPECT. Thus, I HAVE MADE EVERY EFFORT TO BE REASONABLE, RESPECTABLE, AND COOPERATIVE WITH YOU, WITH HOPES OF RECEIVING THE SAME.

IN THE PAST I'VE IGNORED THE UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT YOU'VE DISPLAYED TOWARDS ME, FROM YOUR REFUSALS TO BE COOPERATIVE, TO YOUR SNIDE REMARKS AND FALSE ASSERTIONS. I'VE DONE THIS TO AVOID CONFLICT BUT, I DO NOT BELIEVE - AND YOU CAN'T ARGUE - THAT IT IS MY SOLE RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN THE PEACE IN OUR ATTORNEY/CLIENT RELATIONSHIP. NOR DO I BELIEVE THAT I SHOULD BE EXPECTED TO MAINTAIN MY SILENCE AND ALLOW YOU TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF ME BY INTIMIDATION, THROUGH USE OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAW. AND WITH THAT SAID, I NEED TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE THINGS YOU MENTIONED IN YOUR LETTER: IN THE 5TH AND 7TH PARAGRAPHS, YOU IMPLIED THAT I HAD "MADE UP" SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT I HAVE REQUESTED. ALSO, AT THE END OF THE SAME PARAGRAPH - YOU FURTHER CLAIMED THAT I HAD PERSONALLY REVIEWED "ALL" OF THE DOCUMENTS IN MY CASE; IN THE 6TH PARAGRAPH, YOU CLAIMED THAT I PARTICIPATED IN THE PREPARATION AND EVALUATION OF "EVERY" MATERIAL WITNESS, WITH THE POSSIBLE EXCEPTION OF DR. WILMINGTON. AND IN THE CLOSE OF YOUR LETTER, YOU CLAIM THAT MR. LLOYD AND YOU DID "EVERYTHING" YOU COULD, TO PREPARE FOR MY TRIAL. I ABSOLUTELY DISAGREE WITH ALL OF YOUR CLAIMS. YOU KNOW AS WELL AS I, MR. HATFIELD -

these are false claims! And because they are also defensive, one might wonder if you have something to hide. I feel your assertions are defensive because: if you've done all that you were suppose to (and I supposedly know these things as you claim I do) why do you feel the need to assert them at all, especially when they have nothing to do with my requests? Even in other correspondance, you've felt the need to make assertions beyond the scope of my request. Nevertheless, while there are still questions about discrepancies, I would like to note: in view of the information I do have, and have viewed - Mr. Lloyd did do a commendable job as co-counsel, and up to this point (with the exception of refusing to raise my issues on my appeal) is still doing so.

In your letter you described the volume of records you have on my trial and related matters. You also explained they are unorganized and still contain your personal work product; and how difficult it would be to copy them, if and when it becomes necessary. Further more: you stated, "As I told your father when he called me a few days ago, I do not believe that my duties as a lawyer in North Carolina require me to operate some kind of lending library of innumerable documents, remembered or imagined, that you ask me to find, and copy, and forward to you or your family." Well Mr. Hatfield, while it may or may not be part of your duties "to operate some kind of lending library"; it can't be argued that a lawyer in North Carolina (or any other state) who has a genuine concern for his clients well being will not concentrate so much on "duties", as opposed to how he can "help" his client (within the guidelines of the law). But I do believe it is part of your duties as my attorney to keep me informed of my on-going litigation, my rights, and any laws that concern me, that I might make informed decisions. It would seem that part of those responsibilities (duties), would be to provide me with copies of all documents for my review, answer my questions, and abide by my decisions. If you had done this from the beginning, I wouldn't be making these request now, and even might not be in prison today.

You know that eventually I will need copies of all your records, so why is it so unreasonable for you to start providing them to me now (as you are able)? And especially while the court will cover the expense! My desire to have copies of the documents that I've requested, or any that I might request in the future - is not to satisfy my curiosity. As you well know, there are many statutes of limitation, and due to my lack of knowledge and experience, it is important that I prepare for the next step just in case my appeal is denied, not to mention other litigation that I am in the process of preparing.

In regard to my father calling you: I do not appreciate you taking out your aggression and frustrations on him. He was simply relaying "my" request. Like your snide comments, it was not necessary and very

unprofessional. AS FAR AS I'm CONCERNED, AN apology is IN ORDER. He would appreciate it AND so would I but, I'll LEAVE it to you AND your own HEART AS to what to DO. Just for the RECORD: I ASKED that you LEND Documents to my family so AS to help you AND for your CONVENIENCE, since you told me that you could NOT ENSURE the cost of making COPIES. Now you tell me that it is TIME AND LABOR! BEAR IN MIND MR. HATFIELD - you set the price AND you chose to REPRESENT me. The poor organization of your files is NOT my fault but, if I could help you I would, AND the same is true of my family. HOWEVER: it is NOT my families RESPONSIBILITY to obtain COPIES of Documents that I NEED, but RATHER LUDICROUS, senseless, AND unfair for them to RUN AROUND waisting time trying to find AND obtain COPIES of Documents you ALREADY HAVE. MANY of the Documents I NEED ARE NOT public RECORD AND COPIES CAN ONLY be obtained through you.

AS for the COURT DATES I REQUESTED, AND the MEMORANDUM Circulated by Det. J.D. Church, I Apologize for NOT making myself Clear. I gave the copy of the MEMORANDUM I RECEIVED from Janet to Mr. Lloyd. I WANTED to know the DATES of ANY hearings PRIOR to my TRIAL such as the BOND hearing OR First APPEARANCES.

MR Hatfield, I DON'T KNOW what CAUSED your DEFENSIVE ANIMOSITY towards me but, we BOTH HAVE SAID what WE HAVE SAID. I'm willing to DO whatever I CAN to work things out, put this BEHIND us, AND move ON. I DON'T wish to be in CONFRONTATION with you but, I DO wish to HAVE your COOPERATION because I NEED your help. I hope you're ALSO willing to put this BEHIND us AND move ON AS WELL.

I'm SORRY to hear NEITHER MR Lloyd OR you were NOT PAID in the Smith case. But I would be VERY interested to SEE what you prepared because: AS I MENTIONED EARLIER in this letter, I have other Litigation AND some of what you've prepared might prove to be helpful.

AFTER you CONTACTED the STUMP family AND visited me, we were CONVINCED by your ZEALOUS attitude that if HIRED you would REPRESENT me to the best of your ability, AND put my best interest first. All I ASK MR. HATFIELD, is PLEASE COOPERATE with me AND REPRESENT me with the same promising attitude - to the best of your ability, with my best interest first. PLEASE let my family OR me know what we CAN do to help you. Thank you.

Respectively,

Ronnie L. Kimble

RONNIE L. KIMBLE
RT. 1 BOX 300
JACKSON, N. CAROLINA 27845

Subscribed AND SWORN to before me

This THE 11th DAY OF June 2000

R. L. Mart
SIGNATURE AND SEAL OF NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission EXPIRES 02-19-03

CC: W. DAVID LLOYD, Attorney At Law