

reportedly more skilled at woodworking, and he had more military training and skills than his brother, as Arthur had been to Vietnam. When the police went to the Rolling Wrench Garage on 10 March, they interviewed John Doering and Arthur Shay, but the report of Arthur Shay's interview is not available, yet, to the author.

The Roslindale Bomb was spray-painted black and Mr. Thomas Shay had an opened can of spray paint in his garage and he had professional spray painting equipment for his work.

We know that the bomb was built sometime after the publication of the July 1991 issue of *MuscleMag International*, so it was likely built for one of the purposes above. That is, it wasn't built at an earlier time for some other person for whatever reasons, but not used; and given to someone which led to its getting to 39 Eastbourne. The arrest of Dennis Owen in June 1992 showed that there are people who built such devices from time to time. Maybe one of his devices was sold to someone which led to 39 Eastbourne, but there wasn't much time between July 1991 and 28 October 1991 to allow for such coincidences. That is, someone wanting such a device and someone having such a device already built was an unlikely coincidence.

On the 28th, Thomas L. Shay may have been as shocked as everyone else about the explosion, because if he was involved, he didn't expect it to explode. To look realistic, yes, but not to explode. While it was assumed by some that he was in some kind of shock after the explosion because he appeared to be the target, he could have just as easily been in shock because he was now responsible for the serious injury of two policemen, and he came close to severely injuring himself, too.

3. What about the 18 October 1991 Radio Shack Receipt? Of all the evidence in the case, this seems to be one of the hardest to explain. Was it the Mother of All Coincidences in this case? Perhaps like the entire Roslindale Bomb case itself, we may never understand the exact truth about it. It's unlikely that Tom Shay was the purchaser because he said nothing about Radio Shack until his attorney, William McPhee, sent him a copy of the Radio Shack receipt in May 1992 and Tom Shay then spun it into his web of explanations. There are too many unknowns about the receipt to make it a conclusive piece of evidence. Why "S A H Y?" Google reports 770,000 "results" for the word "SAHY," with many of them being names of people from Eastern Europe. Why "J Y T?" What was the "5100?" In 1991 there were approximately 34 sets of telephone numbers for Boston, and there were several other variations of the last four digits of Mr. Thomas Shay's phone number, 7380. The Radio Shack Receipt had 3780, but the real number could have ended in 3708, 7308, 3709, 8370, 0378, etc. for a total of 24 different combinations. Thus, in the Boston area, there were 816 (34 X 24) possible phone numbers which might have been accurately or inaccurately given to Dwayne Armbrister on 18 October. If one considers that many Radio Shack customers purchase items outside of their own home city, then the number of possible phone numbers rises dramatically. Of the 97 Radio Shack Receipts which Alfred Trenkler has in his files, none was for a Radio Shack in Milton because there was none. Some were from Quincy where he did live in 1990-1991, but most of the 97 were in cities and towns where Alfred Trenkler never lived, such as Braintree or Cambridge.

If a toggle switch was needed for the Roslindale Bomb, what were the other five items on that receipt used for? Why the different type fonts for the information printed on the receipt? What about Mr. Blair's inability to find the receipt in the Tandy corporate computer system in 1998? What about Allan Kingsbury's initial recollection that the purchaser was a "Middle Eastern" man? What about the coincidence (!) that the manager of the 197 Mass. Ave Radio Shack Store was the roommate of a former lover of Tom Shay, who was, by 18 October, very angry with Shay?

Tom Shay said many things to many people about that receipt, once he learned of its existence, and most of them were false. He told a story to Karen Marinella. He told investigators that he remembered that receipt in Trenkler's car. He told William McPhee that he hadn't been in a Radio Shack since 1989 when he purchased a fog horn in Revere with Ralph Pace. (It might be useful to ask Ralph Pace, what, if anything, he and Tom Shay ever purchased together anywhere, but Mr. Pace cannot be located. Radio Shack doesn't sell any item known as a fog horn, but it does sell items which make loud noises like horns.)

It is not claimed here that any of the investigators, or any of the Radio Shack employees fabricated any part of the receipt. It's possible, but unlikely. If one or more investigators had conspired with Dwayne Armbrister or others to fabricate any part of the receipt, the conspiracy would come apart as some point, just as it's believed here that if there had actually been a conspiracy between Tom Shay and Alfred Trenkler, some concrete evidence of it would have emerged - but none has.

There are too many unknowns for that receipt to remain an important piece of evidence against Tom Shay.

One possible explanation is that the receipt was really for Thomas L. Shay and that he gave his own phone number, but that doesn't explain the "JYT" first name or the "5100" address. It's not known if his photo was included in the photo arrays shown to Allan Kingsbury and Dwayne Armbrister.

Finally, if the toggle switch used in the Roslindale bomb was not a Radio Shack switch, then the 18 October Radio Shack receipt would become totally irrelevant. Then, all the questions about the coincidences would still be interesting, but academic.

#### 4. Guilty or Not Guilty?

Jefferson Boone summed up his former client's case this way in a 2006 email: *"The whole case against Tommy was smoke, mirrors and innuendo, seasoned with Gay-bashing. There was no real evidence, other than his own self-aggrandizing, half-witted statements to the press."* Boone believes that Tom Shay is totally innocent and believes that Nancy Gertner believed that too. At the 2007 national conference of the Innocence Network, a coalition of Innocence Projects well-known for their DNA-related exonerations, Federal Judge Nancy Gertner stated publicly that she continues to believe that she had a client who was convicted but whom she believes to be innocent. At least one member of the 150 person audience knew that she was talking about Tom Shay.