



Supreme Court of Tennessee.
STATE of Tennessee, Petitioner,
v.
James Thomas BANKS, Respondent.
April 17, 1978.

Defendant was convicted in the Criminal Court, Knox County, Joseph J. Nigro, J., of second-degree murder and sentenced to 99 years' imprisonment and he appealed. The Court of Criminal Appeals conditionally granted a new trial and the State's petition for certiorari was granted. The Supreme Court, Brock, J., held that, even though the number of blows to victim's head and body and brutality bore on element of deliberation or premeditation, prejudicial effect of color photographs of victim's battered head and body far outweighed their probative value so that it was error to admit them, but it was not reversible error where other evidence of brutal and horrible murder fully supported the verdict and the severe sentence.

Judgment of Court of Criminal Appeals reversed and that of trial court reinstated.

West Headnotes

[1] Criminal Law 110 ↪438(1)

110 Criminal Law
110XVII Evidence
110XVII(P) Documentary Evidence
110k431 Private Writings and Publications
110k438 Photographs and Other
Pictures
110k438(1) k. In General. Most Cited
Cases

Criminal Law 110 ↪1153.11

110 Criminal Law
110XXIV Review
110XXIV(N) Discretion of Lower Court
110k1153 Reception and Admissibility of
Evidence
110k1153.11 k. Documentary Evidence.

Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 110k1153(1))
Admissibility of photographs lies within discretion of trial court whose ruling in that respect will not be overturned on appeal, except upon clear showing of abuse of discretion.

[2] Criminal Law 110 ↪444.16

110 Criminal Law
110XVII Evidence
110XVII(P) Documentary Evidence
110k444 Authentication and Foundation
110k444.16 k. Photographs and Videos.

Most Cited Cases

(Formerly 110k444)
Before any photograph can be admitted into evidence, it must be verified and authenticated by witness with knowledge of the facts.

[3] Criminal Law 110 ↪338(1)

110 Criminal Law
110XVII Evidence
110XVII(D) Facts in Issue and Relevance
110k338 Relevancy in General
110k338(1) k. In General. Most Cited
Cases

“Relevant evidence” means evidence having any tendency to make existence of any fact that is of consequence to determination of action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.

[4] Criminal Law 110 ↪438(2)

110 Criminal Law
110XVII Evidence
110XVII(P) Documentary Evidence
110k431 Private Writings and Publications
110k438 Photographs and Other
Pictures
110k438(2) k. Particular
Prosecutions. Most Cited Cases
Where “extreme cruelty and atrocity” constitutes one of categories of first-degree murder, that fact is legitimately part of State's case and photographs are proper mode of proving it.

[5] Criminal Law 110 438(5.1)

[110 Criminal Law](#)
[110XVII Evidence](#)
[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)
[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)
[110k438 Photographs and Other Pictures](#)
[110k438\(5\) Depiction of Injuries or Dead Bodies](#)
[110k438\(5.1\) k. In General. Most Cited Cases](#)
(Formerly 110k438(5))

Homicide 203 976

[203 Homicide](#)
[203IX Evidence](#)
[203IX\(D\) Admissibility in General](#)
[203k974 Nature of Act and Attendant Circumstances in General](#)
[203k976 k. Physical Conditions. Most Cited Cases](#)
(Formerly 203k171(2))
Where basis of first-degree murder is clear-cut case of felony homicide, there is no occasion to prove character and extent of wounds at all, and certainly not by inflammatory photographs.

[6] Criminal Law 110 438(5.1)

[110 Criminal Law](#)
[110XVII Evidence](#)
[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)
[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)
[110k438 Photographs and Other Pictures](#)
[110k438\(5\) Depiction of Injuries or Dead Bodies](#)
[110k438\(5.1\) k. In General. Most Cited Cases](#)
(Formerly 110k438(5))
Photographs showing injury of homicide victim are properly admitted if defendant admits he killed a victim but seeks to show a noncriminal homicide or that offense was of lesser degree than murder.

[7] Criminal Law 110 438(6)

[110 Criminal Law](#)
[110XVII Evidence](#)
[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)
[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)
[110k438 Photographs and Other Pictures](#)
[110k438\(5\) Depiction of Injuries or Dead Bodies](#)
[110k438\(6\) k. Purpose of Admission. Most Cited Cases](#)
(Formerly 110k8(6))
Where malice and intent to kill are denied in homicide case, state may prove by photograph that greater force was used against victim than is consistent with defendant's account of the facts.

[8] Homicide 203 542

[203 Homicide](#)
[203II Murder](#)
[203k539 First Degree, Capital, or Aggravated Murder](#)
[203k542 k. Deliberation and Premeditation. Most Cited Cases](#)
(Formerly 203k14(1))
Deliberation or premeditation is element of first-degree murder.

[9] Criminal Law 110 438(7)

[110 Criminal Law](#)
[110XVII Evidence](#)
[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)
[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)
[110k438 Photographs and Other Pictures](#)
[110k438\(7\) k. Photographs Arousing Passion or Prejudice; Gruesomeness. Most Cited Cases](#)
Photographs of corpse are admissible in murder prosecutions, if they are relevant to issues on trial, notwithstanding their gruesome and horrifying character, but, if they are not relevant to prove some part of prosecution's case, they may not be admitted solely to inflame jury and prejudice them against the defendant.

[10] Criminal Law 110 338(7)

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XVII Evidence](#)

[110XVII\(D\) Facts in Issue and Relevance](#)

[110k338 Relevancy in General](#)

[110k338\(7\) k. Evidence Calculated to](#)

Create Prejudice Against or Sympathy for Accused.

[Most Cited Cases](#)

Even relevant evidence should not be admitted if its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value.

[11] Criminal Law 110  **338(7)**

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XVII Evidence](#)

[110XVII\(D\) Facts in Issue and Relevance](#)


[110k338 Relevancy in General](#)

[110k338\(7\) k. Evidence Calculated to](#)

Create Prejudice Against or Sympathy for Accused.

[Most Cited Cases](#)

Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of issues or misleading jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.

[12] Criminal Law 110  **438(5.1)**

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XVII Evidence](#)

[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)

[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)

[110k438 Photographs and Other](#)

Pictures

[110k438\(5\) Depiction of Injuries or](#)

Dead Bodies

[110k438\(5.1\) k. In General. \[Most\]\(#\)](#)

[Cited Cases](#)

(Formerly 110k438(5))

In determining whether prejudicial effect of photographs of corpse outweighs their probative value, matters to be considered include value of photographs as evidence, that is, their accuracy and clarity, whether they were taken before corpse was moved, in case in which position and location of body when found is material, inadequacy of testimonial evidence relating facts to jury and need for evidence to establish prima facie case of guilt or to rebut defendant's contentions.

[13] Criminal Law 110  **438(7)**

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XVII Evidence](#)

[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)

[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)


[110k438 Photographs and Other](#)

Pictures

[110k438\(7\) k. Photographs Arousing](#)

Passion or Prejudice; Gruesomeness. [Most Cited Cases](#)

The more gruesome the photographs of murder victim, the more difficult it is to establish that their probative value and relevance outweigh their prejudicial effect.

[14] Criminal Law 110  **438(5.1)**

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XVII Evidence](#)

[110XVII\(P\) Documentary Evidence](#)

[110k431 Private Writings and Publications](#)

[110k438 Photographs and Other](#)

Pictures


[110k438\(5\) Depiction of Injuries or](#)

Dead Bodies

[110k438\(5.1\) k. In General. \[Most\]\(#\)](#)

[Cited Cases](#)

(Formerly 110k438(5))

Criminal Law 110  **1169.2(7)**

[110 Criminal Law](#)

[110XXIV Review](#)

[110XXIV\(O\) Harmless and Reversible Error](#)

[110k1169 Admission of Evidence](#)

[110k1169.2 Curing Error by Facts](#)

Established Otherwise

[110k1169.2\(7\) k. Documentary and](#)

Demonstrative Evidence. [Most Cited Cases](#)

Even though the number of blows to victim's head and body and brutality bore on element of deliberation or premeditation in murder case, prejudicial effect of color photographs of victim's battered head and body far outweighed their probative value so that it was error to admit them, but it was not reversible error, where other evidence of brutal and horrible murder fully supported verdict of second-degree murder and severe sentence of 99 years' imprisonment. T.C.A. § 40-3409.

*948 David L. Raybin, Asst. Atty. Gen., Nashville, for petitioner; Brooks McLemore, Jr., Atty. Gen., Nashville, of counsel.

Robert L. Tucker, Roger A. Stetter, U. T. Legal Clinic, Robert W. Ritchie, Knoxville, for respondent.

OPINION

BROCK, Justice.

The defendant was convicted of second degree murder and sentenced to 99 years imprisonment. He appealed and the Court of Criminal Appeals conditionally granted a new trial.

The defendant Banks and the victim, Sidney Edward Smith, Jr., attended a party together on the night of the slaying. Banks offered to take Smith home from the party. The next morning Smith's nude body was found lying in a ditch in a Knoxville park. Death had been caused by multiple wounds to the face and head, apparently by the use of a heavy blunt object. Circumstantial evidence pointed strongly to the defendant as the killer. He was seen sitting in his car near the location of the body on the night of the homicide and was also seen in his car with the victim on that night. There was evidence of homosexual or deviate sexual activity between Smith and the defendant. A nightstick of the type used by the defendant in his employment as a security guard and which was capable of inflicting the fatal wounds was found in the defendant's automobile. This nightstick had traces of blood on it. A blood stained leaf found in the defendant's car matched the deceased's blood type. Defendant's automobile was found unlocked in a parking lot a mile or more from the defendant's home. The defendant told conflicting stories about his activities on the night of the slaying.

At the trial the State, over the objection of the defendant, introduced into evidence color photographs, both prints and slides, which depicted the victim's battered head and body. As noted, the defendant objected to the introduction of these photographs upon the ground that they were not relevant to any contested issue in the case and were introduced solely for the purpose of prejudicing the jury against the defendant. The defendant also renewed these objections in his motion for a new trial but did *949 not assign the introduction of these photographs as error in the Court of Criminal Appeals. Nevertheless, that court concluded that the introduction of the photographs amounted to plain error, T.C.A., s 40-3409; Baldwin v. State, 213 Tenn. 49, 372 S.W.2d 188 (1963), which it was bound to

notice and, accordingly, held that a new trial must be afforded the defendant unless the State agreed to accept a reduction of the sentence from 99 years to the minimum of 10 years provided by statute for second degree murder. This Court granted the State's petition for certiorari to consider this single issue.

I

[1] Traditionally, this Court has followed a policy of liberality in the admission of evidence in both civil and criminal cases, State ex rel. Smith v. Livingston Limestone Co., Tenn., 547 S.W.2d 942 (1977), including the admission of photographs. Hughes v. State, 126 Tenn. 40, 148 S.W. 543 (1912); Brown v. State, 186 Tenn. 378, 210 S.W.2d 670 (1948); Livermore Foundry & Machine Co. v. Union Storage & Compress Co., 105 Tenn. 187, 58 S.W. 270 (1900); D. Paine, Tennessee Law of Evidence s 238 (1974). This policy of liberality is often expressed in the "rule" that the admissibility of photographs lies within the discretion of the trial court whose ruling in this respect will not be overturned on appeal except upon a clear showing of an abuse of discretion. Strickland Transportation Company v. Douglas, 37 Tenn.App. 421, 264 S.W.2d 233 (1953); 29 Am.Jur.2d Evidence s 785 (1967); D. Paine, Tennessee Law of Evidence s 238 (1974). Moreover, the trend of modern authority is to vest more discretion in the trial court in this respect. Cagle v. State, Tenn.Cr.App., 507 S.W.2d 121 (1973); See : Uniform Rules of Evidence, Rules 4 and 45, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (1953).

[2] Of course, before any photograph can be admitted into evidence it must be verified and authenticated by a witness with knowledge of the facts.

[3] Once authenticity has been established relevance must be shown. We approve the following definition of relevance found in Rule 401 of the new Federal Rules of Evidence:

“ ‘Relevant evidence’ means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” See also Uniform Rules of Evidence, Rule 1, supra.

A requirement of probability any more stringent than

this would be unworkable and unrealistic.

[4][5] Of course, relevance varies as the elements of the particular offense and the means employed in its commission vary. It has been declared by one court that photographs of the victim and other physical evidence are always relevant to the material facts in a homicide prosecution if the defendant pleads not guilty, Commonwealth v. Novak, 395 Pa. 199, 150 A.2d 102 (1959), but other courts pursue a more narrow analysis of the elements each side must prove and may rebut. For example, where “extreme cruelty and atrocity” constitutes one of the categories of first-degree murder, that fact is legitimately a part of the State’s case, and photographs are a proper mode of proving it. Commonwealth v. Osman, 284 Mass. 421, 188 N.E. 226 (1933). But where the basis of first-degree murder is a clear-cut case of felony homicide, there is no occasion to prove the character and extent of the wounds at all, and certainly not by inflammatory photographs. Commonwealth v. Powell, 428 Pa. 275, 241 A.2d 119 (1968).

[6][7] Photographs showing the injuries of the victim are properly admitted if the defendant admits he killed the victim but seeks to show a non-criminal homicide or that the offense was of a lesser degree than murder. Where malice and intent to kill *950 are denied, the State may prove by a photograph that greater force was used against the victim than is consistent with the defendant’s account of the facts. Wilkerson v. State, 170 Tex.Cr.R. 525, 342 S.W.2d 431 (1961). Where the accused claimed he acted in an insane frenzy, the court approved the use of photographs showing the systematic manner in which he tied up his several victims before killing them one by one. People v. Speck, 41 Ill.2d 177, 242 N.E.2d 208 (1968).

In Cullaro v. State, Fla.App., 97 So.2d 40 (1957), photographs were held properly received to rebut a claim of self defense because they showed that there were no powder burns on the body, such as would have been inflicted had the shots been fired at close range during a struggle.

In Alcorta v. State, Tex.Cr.App., 294 S.W.2d 112 (1956), where the defendant denied stabbing the victim thirty-two times as the State charged, and contended that one Natividad had delivered the fatal blow by striking the victim on the head with a rock, photographs belying his story were shown to the jury

as shedding light upon a material and controverted fact.

In cases of vehicular homicide where the state must establish criminal culpability by the degree of negligence on the part of the defendant, the observable condition of the victim may be a proper matter for the jury to consider in determining the manner and speed at which the defendant was operating his automobile. Pribyl v. State, 165 Neb. 691, 87 N.W.2d 201 (1957). See also People v. Donaldson, 8 Ill.2d 510, 134 N.E.2d 776 (1956); Price v. State, Miss., 54 So.2d 667 (1951); State v. Butler, 27 N.J. 560, 143 A.2d 530 (1958).

Photographs showing the brutally beaten body of the defendant’s twenty-one-month-old daughter were admitted to show he did more than discipline her with a small switch in Hancock v. State, 209 Miss. 523, 47 So.2d 833 (1950). And, where a crucial issue in establishing guilt was whether a particular type of flex-handled wrench found near the defendant’s home was the murder weapon, a photograph of the body showing the wound was peculiarly helpful to the jury. People v. Carter, 48 Cal.2d 737, 312 P.2d 665 (1957).

[8] In this state, deliberation or premeditation is an element of the crime charged against this defendant, viz., first degree murder. We have held that in attempting to establish the degree of the homicide, the state may properly introduce evidence bearing on that issue. In State v. LaChance, Tenn., 524 S.W.2d 933 (1975), we observed:

“We think that the intent to kill may be inferred from the brutality of the attack.

“(T)he succession of blows, the patently vicious manner of their infliction, the enormity of the cruelty and the horrendous injuries suffered provide further evidence of a wilful execution of an intent to kill.” 524 S.W.2d 937, 938.

We quoted with approval from McGill v. State, 4 Tenn.Cr.App. 710, 475 S.W.2d 223 (1972):

“Concerning the weight and sufficiency of evidence to establish premeditation, and particularly with reference to the nature of the act causing death, many courts have held that deliberation and premeditation may be inferred from the manner in which the killing was committed; and that repeated shots, blows, and

other acts of violence are sufficient evidence of premeditation.” [524 S.W.2d at 938](#).

And in [State v. Bullington, Tenn., 532 S.W.2d 556, 560 \(1976\)](#), we held that one circumstance from which the inference of premeditation may be drawn is “repeated shots or blows inflicted upon the victim.”

We conclude, therefore, that the photographs here in issue may be considered to have passed the test of relevancy with respect to the issue of deliberation.

II

[9] The traditional rule is said to be that photographs of the corpse are admissible in *951 murder prosecutions if they are relevant to the issues on trial, notwithstanding their gruesome and horrifying character. [People v. Jenko, 410 Ill. 478, 102 N.E.2d 783 \(1951\)](#). Conversely, if they are not relevant to prove some part of the prosecution's case, they may not be admitted solely to inflame the jury and prejudice them against the defendant. [Milam v. Commonwealth, Ky., 275 S.W.2d 921 \(1955\)](#).

[10][11] But even relevant evidence should not be admitted if its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value. [Fed.R.Evid. 403](#); Uniform Rules of Evidence 45, *supra*.

Federal [Rule 403](#) provides:

“Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.”

In the explanatory note to [Rule 403](#), “unfair prejudice” is defined by the Advisory Committee as:

“An undue tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis, commonly, though not necessarily, an emotional one.”

See also [Haddad v. Kuriger, Ky., 437 S.W.2d 524 \(1968\)](#); [State v. Martinez, 92 Idaho 183, 439 P.2d 691 \(1968\)](#); [Thibodeau v. Connecticut Co., 139 Conn. 9, 89 A.2d 223 \(1952\)](#); [Moeller v. Hauser, 237 Minn. 368, 54 N.W.2d 639, 57 A.L.R.2d 364 \(1952\)](#).

We regard this rule as one that is fair and just and strikes a reasoned balance between probative value and unfair prejudice; we approve it as a proper guide to be followed by our courts in both criminal and civil cases.

[12] Cases recognizing the inherently prejudicial character of photographic depictions of a murder victim enunciate a test whereby certain factors are to be considered by the trial judge. The matters to be taken into consideration include the value of photographs as evidence, that is, their accuracy and clarity, and whether they were taken before the corpse was moved, if the position and location of the body when found is material; the inadequacy of testimonial evidence in relating the facts to the jury; and the need for the evidence to establish a prima facie case of guilt or to rebut the defendant's contentions. If the inflammatory nature of the photograph is thus outweighed, it is admissible.

[13] The more gruesome the photographs, the more difficult it is to establish that their probative value and relevance outweigh their prejudicial effect. [Commonwealth v. Scaramuzzino, 455 Pa. 378, 317 A.2d 225 \(1974\)](#). In the presence of an offer to stipulate the facts shown in the photograph, the State's burden of justification is often difficult to sustain. [People v. Chavez, 50 Cal.2d 778, 329 P.2d 907 \(1958\)](#); [Poe v. Commonwealth, Ky.App., 301 S.W.2d 900 \(1957\)](#). Failure of the defense to dispute the testimony that the photographs illustrate may have the same effect. [People v. Falkner, 389 Mich. 682, 209 N.W.2d 193 \(1973\)](#); [State v. Bucanis, 26 N.J. 45, 138 A.2d 739 \(1958\)](#).

In some cases, photographic evidence has been excluded because it does not add anything to the testimonial descriptions of the injuries. [Archina v. People, 135 Colo. 8, 307 P.2d 1083 \(en banc, 1957\)](#); [Dyken v. State, Fla., 89 So.2d 866 \(en banc, 1956\)](#); [State v. Morgan, 211 La. 572, 30 So.2d 434 \(1947\)](#). Those made during or after an autopsy are most often condemned, [Kiefer v. State, 239 Ind. 103, 153 N.E.2d 899 \(1958\)](#); *State v. Bucanis, supra*, because they present an even more horrifying sight and show the body in an altered condition and because lay jurors normally do not have the experience necessary to draw correct inferences from the appearance of internal organs. [State v. Morris, 245 La. 175, 157 So.2d 728](#)

[\(1963\).](#)

In many cases, the facts concerning the injuries and the cause of death may be adequately established and better explained *952 by a pathologist. In this case, for instance, except for one aspect mentioned below, the testimony gives a far better description of the nature and extent of the wounds inflicted on the victim than the pictures do. The defense did not seriously dispute the cause of death; it sought mainly to show the good relationship of the deceased and the defendant. It did not offer any alternate theory of how the deceased met his death. Thus, the factual issue was not squarely raised in the manner of self-defense, accident or manslaughter cases. *Cullaro v. State*, supra; *Pribyl v. State*, supra; *Alcorta v. State*, supra.

It is true that the defense, upon cross-examination of the pathologist, Dr. Jones, elicited the testimony that the head wounds could have been made by a car running over the victim. Perhaps those pictures may have been slightly relevant to that issue. Nevertheless, their worth seems slight, especially in view of the fact that the slides were taken after the body had been moved from the scene so that the condition of the ground, which would have been highly relevant in resolving that narrow question, was not shown.

As above observed, the number of blows and the brutality of the crime was a circumstance bearing on the element of deliberation or premeditation. A case can be imagined in which a photograph could supplement the medical testimony to give a better understanding of the number of wounds inflicted and the manner in which the killing was carried out, but this was not one. The pathologist catalogued the injuries and described them in detail. He gave more information about them than the photographs do. His explanation is readily understandable without a pictorial portrayal. There is no question, from the whole of the testimony, that death was inflicted from a succession of blows to the head and other parts of the body. The mere recital of the internal injury caused by an object shoved into the anus of the victim establishes premeditation far more vividly than the photographs in issue do.

The State's argument that the photographs are relevant to the assessment of punishment is candid but unpersuasive. Shocking and horrifying the jury emotionally does not assist them in making a reasoned

determination of how serious the crime is, how much deterrence is necessary to prevent like crimes in the future, or what danger the defendant poses to society. It is precisely because of the danger that they will inflict excessive punishment that unnecessarily inflammatory evidence is kept from them. *Kiefer v. State*, supra; [People v. Jackson, 9 Ill.2d 484, 138 N.E.2d 528 \(1956\)](#). The fact that death is now an available penalty for homicide poses, in view of the existing law on that thorny subject, a strong consideration in opposition to appealing to the emotions of jurors in the assessment of punishment.

The Court of Criminal Appeals noted that the trial judge's reasons for admitting the photographs do not appear of record. We regard this as an omission of some seriousness. Without a statement of reasons, the appellate court is constrained to some extent to second-guess the trial judge in a determination lying within his sound discretion. See [People v. Ford, 60 Cal.2d 772, 36 Cal.Rptr. 620, 388 P.2d 892 \(1964\)](#). There is authority for reversing a conviction for failure of the trial judge to weigh the probative value of photographs against their prejudicial effect. The record should show the factors considered by lower courts and their reasons for receiving the evidence.

[\[14\]](#) On balance we conclude, as did the unanimous Court of Criminal Appeals, that the prejudicial effect of these photographs far outweighs their probative value. Therefore, it was error for the trial court to admit the photographs in evidence.

However, it does not follow that the Court of Criminal Appeals was correct in reversing the judgment of the trial court. T.C.A., s 27-117, provides:

“No verdict or judgment shall be set aside or new trial granted by any appellate*953 court, in any civil or criminal case, on . . . account of the improper admission . . . of evidence . . . , unless, in the opinion of the appellate court to which application is made, after an examination of the entire record in the cause, it shall affirmatively appear that the error complained of has affected the results of the trial.”

Following an examination of the entire record in this case, we are of the opinion that it does not affirmatively appear that the error in admission of the photographs has affected the results of the trial. The circumstances of this homicide, aside from the

photographs, are so brutal and horrible that they fully explain and support the verdict of guilty and the severity of the sentence.

Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of Criminal Appeals is reversed and that of the trial court reinstated. Costs are taxed to the defendant. The cause is remanded to the trial court for such further proceedings as may be appropriate.

HENRY, C. J., and FONES, COOPER and HARBISON, JJ., concur.
Tenn., 1978.
State v. Banks
564 S.W.2d 947

END OF DOCUMENT