

179 Conn. App. 605                      FEBRUARY, 2018                      619

State v. Salmond

largely concealed, a high level of prior familiarity likely would be necessary . . . . On the other hand, if a witness has ample opportunity to view a perpetrator under conditions conducive to an accurate identification and identifies him or her shortly thereafter, a lesser degree of familiarity may suffice.” (Citation omitted; footnote omitted.) *Id.*, 707–708.

The record demonstrates that Jackson had a heightened awareness of who was present on Sixth Street, including the defendant. Jackson had interacted with the defendant at least four times in the two weeks prior to the victim’s murder. On the basis of these interactions, Jackson stated that he was able to recognize the defendant by both his appearance and his voice. Jackson also was aware of the ongoing dispute between the defendant and the victim at the time of the shooting. We therefore conclude that the trial court’s finding that Jackson was personally familiar with the defendant was supported by the record.

We next address Jackson’s opportunity to view the defendant at the time of murder. “This consideration implicates factors that relate to the [witness] condition at the time as well as the external environment.” *State v. Artis*, 136 Conn. App. 568, 595, 47 A.3d 419 (2012), *rev’d on other grounds*, 314 Conn. 131, 101 A.3d 915 (2014). Jackson was an eyewitness to the crime. As the trial court explained, Jackson “had a front row seat to [the victim’s] murder.” Jackson even referred to himself as the “star witness” because he “[was] the one closest to the person that got killed.” Jackson had two opportunities to view the defendant in broad daylight on the morning of the murder; once from the front passenger seat of the vehicle, and again as he fled from the crime scene and saw the unmasked defendant.

Jackson’s description of the perpetrator’s appearance, which was given prior to the unduly suggestive

NOTE: These pages (179 Conn. App. 619 and 620) are in replacement of the same numbered pages that appear in the Connecticut Law Journal of 13 February 2018.

620 FEBRUARY, 2018 179 Conn. App. 605

---

State v. Salmond

---

police identification procedure and his identification of the defendant from a photographic array, was generally consistent with the defendant's appearance as captured by the surveillance video, as described by the 911 caller<sup>7</sup> and as testified to by Jackson at trial. The defendant contends that Jackson's differing descriptions as to what type of pants the assailant was wearing suggests that he altered his original description after viewing the surveillance video. We disagree that this claimed discrepancy is significant, as Jackson himself acknowledged that he was not staring at the assailant's pants and was not sure what he was wearing. We note that Jackson, when testifying before the jury, stated for the first time that the defendant's face was uncovered and visible as they ran away from Sixth Street. Although Jackson's withholding of this fact until trial was proper fodder for the jury to consider when assessing his credibility, it does not significantly impact our analysis of the defendant's claim on appeal. See *State v. Williams*, supra, 317 Conn. 713–14 (fact that witness gave more complete description of defendant at trial than during police interview does not compel reversal of trial court's ruling).

Finally, the eight day time period between the crime and Jackson's interview in which he identified the defendant is not so long as to render Jackson's identification unreliable.<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., *State v. Sanchez*, 128 Conn.

---

<sup>7</sup> The caller described the gunman as being "very tall," wearing all black and having a black and white bandana covering his face.

<sup>8</sup> Additionally, although Jackson did not come forward with information voluntarily, the court properly viewed these facts under the totality of the circumstances, given the unwillingness of neighborhood residents to provide information or testimony for fear of being labeled as a "snitch." The court itself noted that "[it understood] how difficult it is to get people to testify in inner city homicides." Jackson testified that being known on the street as a snitch was not a good reputation to have. The court also heard testimony from the 911 caller that his aunt told him to "shut up" in Spanish while he was speaking to the 911 operator, and that she was not supportive of his speaking to police. Bridgeport Police Officer Ilidio Pereira, the initial officer to arrive on scene, testified that he was not "successful in locating anyone