

**THE WEEKENDER**  
**ISSUE 1 NO. 3**  
**MARCH 21, 1980**

**WEEKENDER:** Charlie, one of the comments of the last two weeks, from the interviews read by the public, is "Who is this Charles King?" Why did you get involved and why are you so involved at this point?

**KING:** It's like I said in the beginning, Kim was a friend of mine. Now, this friend of mine is arrested for murder. I have the right to believe that he is innocent until proven guilty. As I watched the case against Kim Hubbard build nothing made sense to me.

I was hearing things from the Hubbards, who were so distraught at the time, that if they were lying to me, they were giving Academy Award performances.

When I heard Mr. Fierro tell me that if I wanted to help Kim I should stay in the background, that I shouldn't go anywhere near the trial, that he would call on me if he wanted me to testify, I accepted that as he was Kim's attorney.

This conversation took place in Mr. Fierro's office. The reason I went to see Mr. Fierro was on October 21, 1973. I stopped at the Hubbard home around 12 pm, I was on my way to the Little League World Series field to play football, I got Kim out of bed, he didn't have a shirt on, I saw he wasn't scratched up or anything like that.

**WEEKENDER:** So, you've never believed Kim Hubbard was guilty?

**KING:** Never.

**WEEKENDER:** Even with the preponderance of exhibits the prosecution had at the trial?

**KING:** That's way convinced me he was innocent.

**WEEKENDER:** What?

**KING:** I said earlier in this interview that I have yet to see a single piece of evidence used against Kim Hubbard that would stand up as perjury against the State Police in the event someone else came forward and confessed to this crime.

**WEEKENDER:** Even with the tire casts and boot prints?

**KING:** What I have discovered in the six years I have spent in this case is what I call a "safety-valve" prosecution.

**WEEKENDER:** What do you mean by that?

**KING:** First of all, eliminate the sex that was supposed to take place, that was used to get the public involved. Everybody was all fired up to get this child molester, whoever it was, and Jennifer wasn't molested.

Then, when you get right down to what Kim Hubbard is serving 10-to-20 years in prison for. It's tire casts, boot casts, and a woman who saw a girl get into a green car in front of her home at 4:30 in the afternoon.

**WEEKENDER:** Not really conclusive evidence, in other words?

**KING:** No.

**WEEKENDER:** In other words, you feel the evidence used was circumstantial at best, controversial at the worst?

**KING:** Absolutely.

**WEEKENDER:** Did anyone, in the course of the trial, ever place Kim Hubbard with Jennifer Hill on the afternoon of October 19<sup>th</sup>, 1973?

**KING:** No.

**WEEKENDER:** Did anyone in the course of the trial say specifically where Jennifer Hill died?

**KING:** No.

**WEEKENDER:** Did anyone, in the course of the trial say specifically when she died?

**KING:** Specifically? No.

**WEEKENDER:** A comment you made a little bit ago was something about a “safety-valve” prosecution. What did you mean by that?

**KING:** Well, Kim’s convicted on casts, and to some degree on Mrs. Nevel’s testimony. Let’s say someone comes forward and confesses to this crime today.

Your first thought would be that someone’s in trouble for perjury. Let’s take Mrs. Nevel. Keep in mind that Joe Mendez testified a girl matching Jennifer Hill’s description was on the corner of Market St. and Central Ave. at five minutes to four.

Beth Nevel is the key to Mrs. Nevel’s testimony. Suppose somebody came forward and confessed. Then Beth would have been mistaken and everything Mrs. Nevel testified to has no weight. Now, this strikes me as odd. Mrs. Nevel was hypnotized to help her recollection.

What is the one thing that Mrs. Nevel will not be able to identify? The people have already read where numerous people have testified Jennifer was seen with dark blue pants on her way home. None of them were hypnotized. Now, think about this, if Mrs. Nevel had identified the pants...wouldn’t she be trapped in perjury if someone else had come forward and confessed?

**“either a lie at this end or the other end...”**

We know Jennifer was found in light blue pants on the 28<sup>th</sup>. The hard part about this is you have to remember Mr. Mendez. I said earlier that Police Chief Smith said to the Hubbard’s, “There’s either a lie at this end or the other end.”

Suppose something did happen at the other end and Mrs. Nevel identified Jennifer’s pants color. Since she lives nowhere near Jennifer’s path of travel home, her identification of the pants would have either trapped the hypnotist, the State Police, or her in falsifying the evidence.

Now, there are four tire casts in evidence against Kim Hubbard. Let’s use common sense and we will suppose this man from the bulldozer crew left a giant pile of mud on the lane. If Kim drove in frontwards or backwards and then drove back out that is eight times the mud would have had to have been run through.

That is assuming there was only big clump of mud. Since there are four separate tire casts, each one going to a different tire on Kim’s car, ask yourself how is this possible when one tire follows the other tire on each side of the car.

In the transcripts, after this mud was supposed to have been left by Kremser Bros., a truck from DER went up that lane for the purposes of sketching the tank area. Then the truck left.

Now we have this fresh poured mud with four tires running over it on the way in the four tires running over it on the way out, that’s eight times.

Now we will say Kim Hubbard drives in over this mud and then he drives out. That’s eight more times.

So, using logic, you would have to assume that this mud had been run through

sixteen (16) times and regardless of which way Kim Hubbard left that field, be it frontwards or backwards, it was the sixteenth time a tire had run through that mud that Kim left these prints which were so good that the letters ELD from the word Springfield was left in the mud.

Now, I'm going to read from Paul Kremser's testimony on page 429, when he is being questioned by Mr. Ertel.

**Q:** Are you familiar with that clay-type mud soil as far as what it does when it dries?

**A:** I think I am qualified to say I would be, yes.

**Q:** Describe what it does when it dries?

**A:** Well, it stays mushy for some time, I would say many a day and a half, two days, depending on the consistency of the water in it and how much sunlight there is shining on it, and then after it gets pretty dry why it is what we might call bony, or if you step on it or drive on it, it could crack and crumble.

**“that this mud had been run through sixteen times...”**

End of Kremser's testimony in this interview.

I have here two affidavits from people who have come to the Hubbard's with information that a vehicle was on the lane where Jennifer Hill was found after Kim Hubbard's tires were to have left prints on the lane.

**WEEKENDER:** Do we have permission to reproduce them in the **WEEKENDER**?

**KING:** Yes.

**WEEKENDER:** These affidavits state there was a white van in the lane during the nine-day period when Jennifer was missing. According to Paul Kremser, the caked mud should have shattered if it had been run over after it dried. Apparently it didn't. Can you give any reason why?

**KING:** I guess we can write this off as one of the hundreds of unanswered questions in the state's prosecution of the Kim Hubbard case.

**WEEKENDER:** And how many times would you say this mud had been run over, wet and dry?

**KING:** Well, let's add them up. The DER drives in and out...that's eight. Kim drives in and out, that's eight more. To the best of my knowledge the two men on the affidavits don't know each other and we have three occasions in affidavits so that's assuming this van drove in and drove out we're going to come up with at least 24 times the mud gets hit by these tires. It's at least 40 times this mud could have driven through and only Kim Hubbard's tires leave impressions.

**WEEKENDER:** That's a lot of times for the mud to be run through. Yet, only Kim Hubbard's tires left impressions. Has anyone tried to explain this?

**KING:** The more questions you ask about why something wasn't done for Kim is the whole purpose of this story.

The Hubbard's and Kim don't need sympathy. They need your help. There has been a silent war fought here. Thanks to this newspaper having the courage to hear what we have had to say and follow up on our statements.