

92%**RAW SCORE****99%****ADJUSTED SCORE**

Innocence Claim



Claimant's full name: Steph Turner
 Contact info: valuerelating@gmail.com
 Proxy's full name: Alisha Turner
 Proxy contact info:

SYNOPSIS



Asexual person comes out as trans in early 90s. Is spiritually compelled to transcend polarizing differences to resolve needs. Nonconformity results in being falsely accused as a "sexual predator" homophobic stereotype. Convicted without evidence. Must register as sex offender for life. Forced into poverty and homelessness. Rejected cornerstone.



Highlight 1	No other criminal history
Highlight 2	Consistently maintained innocence, took no plea deals
Highlight 3	Transphobic investigation and prosecution
Highlight 4	Convicted without corroborating evidence
Highlight 5	Climate of sex abuse hysteria
Highlight 6	Media sensationalized coverage
Highlight 7	Exculpatory evidence overlooked with untested DNA
Highlight 8	Spiritual compulsion to resolve needs at odds with judicial system

Tagline: Asexual "transspirit" registered for life as a sex offender

FLIPSIDE



Prior to accepting herself as transgender, Janet (principal & codefendant) often ran afoul of the law. She appears to have suffered Asperger's (high functioning autism), so was slow at responding to social cues. Overcoming shame of being gender different helped her escape cycles of self-defeating behaviors. She overcame dyslexia and other challenges to lead a healthy life, until this happened.

SUMMARY



On July 7th, 1993, Steph Turner awoke to hear voices from the other room. Steph could hear her sister Janet talking to someone. That person left, but later returned with her irate mother to accuse Janet of an incredulous crime. You see, Janet was born male and now openly transgender, long before that was socially acceptable. And Janet had yet to fully transition.

At the height of the sex abuse hysteria in the early-90s, Steph came out as gender-nonconforming transgender. But living in a religiously conservative community, Steph kept it private. Steph soon came out to Janet, years after Janet had. They shared an apartment to rekindle their newfound bond. Both now freely embracing their feminine sides. Both felt asexual by not being loved for their full selves. Both drawn to the spirituality of transcending the gender divide.

A neighborhood child drew curious, peeping into Janet's window to gawk at what she called the "man with lipstick." When caught not being home on time, the child leveled bizarre claims of sex abuse unbecoming from a child. Exposed to porn?

The child then dragged Steph into her transphobic-indoctrinated accusations. The child claimed Steph posed with her as if she, the young child, was stabbing Steph in the chest with a jelly stained butter knife. She claimed this was to scare her from talking to police, that we would say she was the aggressor. Unbelievable? Not if you already believe trans people are subhuman.

Child testimonies back then were often coached. Trans people were easily vilified. Since no corroborating evidence was necessary back then to convict for sexual misconduct, both transwomen were wrongly convicted and sentenced to long terms in men's prisons, where Steph's codefendant transgender sibling died in 2001.

Repeated efforts to overcome this wrongful conviction failed. After serving a full 12-year sentence, Steph was discharged and finished undergraduate and graduate degrees. But is required to register as a sex offender for life, destroying economic and other opportunities. Your support can help turn this around.

\$600,000 estimated eligible compensation under state law

**"We know without doubt
that the vast majority of
innocent defendants
who are convicted of crimes
are never identified and cleared."**

Samuel R. Gross, *NRE*

AVOID, AVOID, AVOID

The more one holds authority over the politically vulnerable, the easier to ignore their situation. We patently ignore the wrongly convicted innocent out of the prejudice that presumes all claims of innocence are self-serving denial of culpability. This itself is denial of ignored innocence. Too much reliance upon subjective "law" enables you to avoid the objective reality of overlooked needs. "Need-response" exists to correct this problem.

Need-response

Need-response is a new service to ***respond more effectively to needs*** than the contentious law. It instills the discipline of empirical measures to raise our accountability to reach need-resolving outcomes. It answers the many weaknesses built into law, to address overlooked needs. This includes the need for us all to face overlooked wrongful convictions.

Law-centric

VAGUE

The law must remain **vague** to apply to a wide range of situations. But when too general, it easily overlooks specific needs. Current law fails to distinguish between the rightly convicted guilty and the wrongly convicted innocent. Need-response has an answer.

IMPERSONAL

The law must remain **impersonal** to steer clear of favoritism. When too impersonal, this risks alienating each other instead of engaging the impacted needs. Current law impersonally lumps the rightly convicted guilty with the wrongly convicted innocent. Need-response has an answer.

PUNITIVE

The law must remain **punitive** to discourage anyone from violating others. But this easily provokes mutual hostility by taking sides against each other's unchangeable needs. Current law punishes the wrongly convicted innocent as much if not more than the rightly convicted guilty. Need-response has an answer.

Need-responsive

NUANCE

Instead of relying on generalizations, need-response gets to the specifics affecting our needs. Instead of the overgeneralizing guilt-or-innocent binary, this EIR provides the nuance of a calculated degree of viable innocence from comparing this claim with known exonerations.

ENGAGEMENT

Instead of remaining in the dark, need-response illuminates each other's impacted needs. Instead of the black box legal process forcing claimants to wait years for a response, this EIR provides an instant evaluation of their likely innocence. This also enables lawyers and prosecutors to quickly address viable claims.

MUTUALITY

Instead of sticking with an imposed adversarial conflict, need-response holds each accountable to addressing the impacted needs on each side. Instead of a win-lose outcome, this EIR provides a path toward all involved to a win-win outcome of resolving all affected needs. It challenges the legitimacy of any resistant authority.

Impact Parity Model (IPM)

Need-response addresses problems resulting from power relations, in which one or more persons in authority knowingly or unknowingly imposes their advantage over others under their authority. This typically coaxes them away from resolving their impacted needs.

Need-response balances the dynamics of power relations to resolve the needs on all sides. It instills the discipline to balance the impact each has on the other. This enables the powerless in the relation to speak truth to power (STTP). And it incentivizes the powerful to listen to those impacted (LTTI).

Need-response identifies the powerful one in a power relation as the "ascribed impactor" and the relatively less powerful one as the "reporting impacttee". Later, these change to "acknowledged impactor" and "recognized impacttee".



Ascribed Impactor

(**AI**) impacts the relationship more than impacted by it.

feels confident & optimistic
sees opportunities, not threats
approaches, not avoids
presents authentic self

Reporting Impacttee

(**RI**) is impacted by the relationship more than impacts it.

feels negative & pessimistic
sees threats, not opportunities
avoids, not approaches
presents social façade

Once issued this EIR, you may no longer avoid innocence.

Competent Leader or Privileged Offender

The more this innocence claim is supported by the available facts, the more opportunity to improve professional competency to interact with the innocent.

The more this supported innocence claim gets ignored to protect selfish interests, the more the complicit innocence denier can be flagged as a “privileged offender”.

OUR OFFERINGS

Value Relating will provide for free a guide for being effectively responsive to viable innocence claims. Go further by investing in a compelling innocence claim to develop your professional competency to serve justice needs.

1. **Minimal standard** (free): cease harm by recognizing viability of this innocence claim.
2. **Competitive competency** (\$): engage us to learn and develop better ways to respond to neglected justice needs.
3. **Transformative leadership** (\$): join us in cultivating your leadership potential to transform how we collectively serve justice needs.

IF FAILING THE MINIMUM STANDARD

WARNING 1: Privileged Offense of Imposing Prejudice

Those persisting in their biased beliefs that the adversarial judicial process rarely if ever creates miscarriages of justice are given a “justifism quiz” to identify their awareness level of overlooked problems with this system. Ignoring this accountability to correct your privileged offenses against innocent persons’ ignored justice needs instantly collapses your legitimacy to impact the vulnerable, opening the door to all of our adversarial options. Recognizing these misconceptions and willingly correcting them can improve competencies to legitimately interact with the wrongly convicted innocent. “What gets measured more readily gets done.”

WARNING 2: Privileged Offense of Imposing Legalism

Those insisting the law must be followed without regard to its impact on vulnerable needs are to be issued a “legality questionnaire” that requires identifying the specific needs served by each cited law and how its impacts are specifically measured. Ignoring this accountability to link cited laws to impacted needs inevitably collapses your legitimacy to impact the vulnerable, opening the door to all of our adversarial options. Prioritizing inflexible needs over flexible laws that ostensibly exist to serve such needs opens the door to more effectively address and engage each other’s alienated justice needs created by the adversarial judicial process. “What gets measured more readily gets done.”

WARNING 3: Privileged Offense of Imposing Costs

Those continuing to fall below the minimum standard and continue to threaten privileged harm are to be issued an “exaction invoice” identifying the imposed costs of ongoing harm. Ignoring this accountability to cease harm inevitably collapses your legitimacy to impact the vulnerable, opening the door to all of our adversarial options. Acknowledging these imposed yet unethically privileged costs can open negotiations for how to effectively resolve each other’s impacted needs, including any need to waive the cited costs, toward improved competencies for serving overlooked justice needs. “What gets measured more readily gets done.”

GOING BEYOND THE MINIMUM STANDARD

OPPORTUNITY

Those seeking to move beyond the minimal standard of ceasing complicity with the harmful criminal judicial system can develop competencies with us to better serve justice needs with **need-response**. Contact **Value Relating** to discover how to establish your brand as one more responsive to vulnerable needs than mere law. Create value by measurably resolving overlooked needs, utilizing the tools of anankology, the new social science for the disciplined understanding of our many needs.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

- Establish your marketable expertise
- Connect deeper with constituents
- Grow your audience reach
- Attract revenue
- Lead with love

"JUSTIFISM"

justifying irrational processes and outcomes of the adversarial justice system;
uncritical acceptance of the mostly nonscientific process of arbitrary judicial processes;
rationalizing unjust objectification of human subjects in the name of justice.

"It is better that ten guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer."

It is now easier for the accused to admit their human imperfections than for police and prosecutors to humbly and honestly admit theirs.

This tool is in pilot mode. It aims to calculate a likelihood of innocence compared to known cases of exoneration. It can be improved by feedback from each person utilizing it and receiving it.

[click here to contact me with your feedback to this tool](#)

Competitive legitimacy

Wrongful convictions run the gamut from totally innocent to complicated involvement. From convicted of a heinous sex crime that never occurred to complex situations where a child dies and the grieving mother is implicated by discredited forensic science of burn patterns.

The business of addressing damages from interpersonal violence is serious business. The sledgehammer approach to many crime investigations suggest “criminal justice” is more criminal than justice. Tunnel vision, confirmation bias, emotionally charged investigations, tainted interviewing and other routines practices ensures wrongful convictions likely occur at a faster pace than currently being cleared by the same process committing these egregious errors.

Can the same conflicted process repeatedly creating damaging mistakes continue to be trusted as the exclusive means to correct such egregious errors? This alternative puts that question to the test. Which would you prefer? Keep pitting human beings against each other from the untested faith as a way to find truth and justice? Or address all the needs involved in each conflict. This “need-response” alternative dares to serve as a better option than the disappointing legal process.

	Legal process: IP & CIU	Need-response: EIR
Claims data	No transparent compiling or posting of claims data	Compiles comparable data and made public (without ID)
Claims process	Relies on opaque legal process with many conflicts of interest	Available to public scrutiny to determine for themselves
Claimant trauma	Risks retraumatizing claimant with adversarial approach	Allays risks of retraumatizing with conciliatory approach
Claims outcome	Adversarial win-lose outcome	Conciliatory win-win outcome
Claims result	Rejects most claims for review largely from lack of resources	Posts all claims for public scrutiny and public investment
Timeliness	Slow, opaque process led by embattled lawyers	Instantly available for all to see once posted online
Standard	Accountable to subjectively interpreted law	Accountable to objective reality of resolved needs
Impact	Risks discouraging claimants from ever seeking exoneration again	Empowers claimants to go directly to the people with case

Welcome to **competitive legitimacy**, which incentivizes alternatives to addressing a common need and awards those most effective in resolving such needs. Competitive legitimacy is a tool of need-response, which applies anankelogy, the new social science for the study and better understanding of many needs. Welcome to this experiment to resolve needs using a fresh understanding of affected justice needs.