

**IN THE DISCIPLINARY DISTRICT IX
OF THE
BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE**

IN RE: STEPHEN P. JONES, BPR #16764 DOCKET NO. 2016-2534-9-KH
Respondent, an Attorney Licensed
to Practice Law in Tennessee
(Shelby County)

DECLARATION OF CHRIS CRAFT PURSUANT TO TENN. R. CIV. P. 72

CHRIS CRAFT states as follows:

1. I am the judge presiding in Division VIII of the Criminal Court of Tennessee for the Thirtieth Judicial District at Memphis. I have been a judge in that court for twenty-one years.
2. I presently serve as the Chair of the Board of Judicial Conduct and have served in that capacity for several years. I previously served on the predecessor of that body, the Court of the Judiciary, for several years as well.
3. I was the trial judge who presided over the trial and the post-trial proceedings in *State v. Noura Jackson*.
4. I understand that the Respondent in this case, Stephen P. Jones, is being accused of unethical conduct tied to his failure to make disclosure of the third statement of Andrew Hammack until after trial.
5. I am well aware that the Tennessee Supreme Court ultimately disagreed with my ruling as to whether the timing of the disclosure of that statement was a *Brady* violation, but also that the Tennessee Supreme Court did not set aside my finding that Mr. Jones' conduct was unintentional.

6. It remains my opinion that Mr. Jones did not intentionally withhold the third Hammack statement and that the delay in disclosing it until after the trial had ended was the result of an act of inadvertence.

7. I do not consider the facts associated with the delayed disclosure of the third Hammack statement to be a violation of Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 8, RPC 3.8(d) by Mr. Jones.

8. I also have no knowledge of any order entered by me in the Noura Jackson matter which was violated by Mr. Jones through the delayed disclosure of the third statement of Mr. Hammack.

9. I have always taken my ethical obligations as a judge seriously and was well aware at the time of the trial, and post-trial proceedings, in the Noura Jackson case of the things I would be ethically required to do had I been of the opinion that Mr. Jones had purposely withheld the third Hammack statement or of the opinion that the statements made by Mr. Jones in the Notice of Omitted Jencks Statement in Relation to the Testimony of Andrew Hammack, filed in my court on February 26, 2009, were something less than truthful.

10. I did not make any report of his conduct to the Board of Professional Responsibility nor did I take any other action to sanction or reprimand him for his conduct because I did not consider, and still do not consider, him to have engaged in any unethical conduct.

Pursuant to Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure 72, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.


CHRIS CRAFT

Dated: 7/15/16