

**Charles L. Wille**

---

**From:** Crespo, Elvin J [EJCrespo@uspis.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 02, 2005 2:41 PM  
**To:** Cwille@ag.state.oh.us  
**Cc:** Katz, Lawrence  
**Subject:** FW: Concern re: Spirko investigation  
**Importance:** High  
**Sensitivity:** Confidential  
**Attachments:** Heath ltr..doc

Mr. Wille- I left a message with your secretary this afternoon relative to correspondence the Inspection Service received from an inspector from our Cleveland field office. The letter addresses a management style concern the inspector had with supervisor, Paul Hartmann, the retired inspector who had investigative responsibility for the Spirko investigation. Although the letter focuses on Hartmann's management style, it also alludes to the Spirko pending execution. Please review the letter. I'd like to discuss it with you at your convenience. Thanks.

Elvin

---

**From:** Katz, Lawrence  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 01, 2005 3:47 PM  
**To:** Crespo, Elvin J  
**Subject:** FW: Concern re: Spirko investigation

Please call me.

---

**From:** Heath, Lee R  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 01, 2005 3:36 PM  
**To:** Katz, Lawrence  
**Subject:** FW: Concern re: Spirko investigation

PLEASE READ

---

**From:** Duerr, Gregory A  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2005 10:36 AM  
**To:** Heath, Lee R  
**Subject:** Concern re: Spirko investigation

<<Heath ltr..doc>>

9/14/2005

August 31, 2005

Mr. Leroy Heath  
Chief Inspector  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Heath,

First, let me say I have been an inspector for twenty-three years and to this point, for the most part have been proud of the agency and what we do. During my career I have been responsible for several high profile investigations and spent three years as a team leader, while in Detroit, Michigan. My record is exemplary.

In 1993, I voluntarily transferred to Cleveland, Ohio. My first assignment placed me under the supervision of Inspector Paul Hartman. My experience working for this individual was less than desirable. I personally was subject to hostile treatment and constant harassment. I witnessed unprofessional comments and in some instances, conduct bordering on criminal. Only because of an assignment change, through Inspector in Charge, Ira Carle, did I survive the emotional distress. Let me emphasize, that most inspectors in the Division at the time were aware of how Inspector Hartman operated, but because of self-preservation, were powerless to do anything.

Approximately 1998, I was approached by another inspector in the Division and informed Inspector Hartman's behavior had reached a point that several inspectors were going to the Field Inspector in Charge to file complaints. I was being asked to accompany them because of my experience with Inspector Hartman. Approximately fifteen inspectors, in a compliment of thirty-five, met with Field Inspector in Charge, Tom Macioch and filed complaints. Official statements were presented at the meeting. Over the course of the next week or so, Inspector Macioch and Acting Assistant Inspector in Charge Robin Dalglish met individually with inspectors. The outcome was that Inspector Hartman retired sooner than he wanted. There should be a file reflecting this.

The aforementioned background was explained, to place context to the purpose of this letter. Over the course of the last year, newspaper articles have appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer regarding the investigation, conducted by Paul Hartman, into the murder of the Postmistress of Elgin, Ohio in 1982. Based on the information presented in the articles and conversations with inspectors who were in the Division at the time, it appears an individual who did not commit the crime is going to be executed.

Needless to say, most if not all inspectors in Cleveland have concerns about what is transpiring. We are under the impression that our agency has taken a "hands-off" approach to this, even with the knowledge they have of Paul Hartman. To date, not one inspector in Cleveland has been talked to by anyone in our agency, to see if they can provide information that would ensure an innocent man is not executed. Interestingly, during a Field Office meeting, when Acting Inspector in Charge Guy Cotrell, opened the floor for questions or concerns, I asked if the agency was doing anything to ensure the right person was being executed. Inspector Cotrell only responded, "We're aware of it". As a result of my asking the question, I was ordered to drive two hours to Pittsburgh, PA for a meeting with Inspector Cotrell. At the meeting, I was threatened with increased scrutiny of my workload to ensure I did not have time to think up questions.

I am making you aware of this, only because I thought this agency prided itself on integrity and the pursuit of justice. As it stands now, the impression I and most all the inspectors in Cleveland have is not only does the agency not pursue justice but they are condoning a level of management that uses heavy handed tactics and creates a hostile workplace.

I realize the easy thing, is to say we have cooperated and the investigation is in the hands of the judicial system. This response distances us from feeling like we personally are responsible for the execution of an innocent man. But, being aware of the apparent issues in this investigation and the knowledge of the character of the inspector responsible for the investigation, and not proactively attempting to seek justice, places each of us in the position of being personally responsible for the execution.

Let me be clear, I am only asking that we as an agency request the execution be delayed until the serious issues indicating innocence be truly resolved. If the issues can be resolved to bring us to the point of "beyond a reasonable doubt", then the conviction and sentence stands. As it stands, the Inspection Service, unlike several former Federal Judges, a former FBI Director and a current sitting Federal Judge, has placed itself on the side of injustice.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this letter.

Gregory A. Duerr  
U. S. Postal Inspector