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Bullets Write Finish to Chilton Case

By JAMES T. COX

Chilton lived, perhaps, every lawyer in the nation. At every meeting and event, a prosecutor would have known his name when the U.S. Supreme Court heard his appeal this fall.

Chilton was a leader in the case of Terry, a black man, and his white co-defendant, who was convicted of a crime once in his life, in 1964. He was convicted of carrying a concealed weapon on busy Euclid Avenue. Chilton's name might rank the same as other landmark cases like Gideon, Escobedo, and Miranda. But it was not to be.

INSTEAD OF an appeal, Richard Chilton, 28, took three bullets — one in the head, another in the chest and a third in the heart — in a drug store holding in Columbus Friday. Bullets were still ricocheting around the store when Chilton slumped dead on the floor.

Chilton's three buddies in the holdup escaped with an estimated $20,000, the money the store used to cash checks each Friday. They left Chilton behind, dead, and the two gunmen who had done the shooting — Chilton was one of them — left the drug store owner severely wounded.

The bullet that hit Robert R. Bender, 38, the co-owner, went in his left temple near the eye, and exited through his right eye, taking that eye with it. Doctors at Columbus' Mercy Hospital hope they can save the remaining eye.

AMONG THE constitutional questions involved, Stokes said last night, is whether a court can substitute a 'stop and frisk' doctrine in order to avoid the dictates of the Fourth Amendment, which guards against unreasonable searches. Stockes touched the heart of the matter when he concluded:

"I could see the validity of an arrest if the time was 2:30 a.m., not 2:30 p.m., and don't think that's the law."