

**People v Waller**

2021 NY Slip Op 33150(U)

January 7, 2021

County Court, Westchester County

Docket Number: Ind. No.18-1312

Judge: David S. Zuckerman

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(U), are republished from various New York State and local government sources, including the New York State Unified Court System's eCourts Service.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

COUNTY COURT: STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

-----X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

-against-

**FILED**

DECISION & ORDER

JOSEPH WALLER,

JAN 29 2021

Ind. No.: 18-1312

TIMOTHY C IDONI  
COUNTY CLERK  
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

-----X

ZUCKERMAN, J.

Defendant stands accused under Indictment No. 20-0274 of two counts of Burglary in the Second Degree (Penal Law §140.25[2]), Burglary in the Third Degree (Penal Law §140.20), Attempted Burglary in the Third Degree (Penal Law §110/140.20), two counts of Grand Larceny in the Fourth Degree (Penal Law §155.30[2]), two counts of Criminal Possession of Stolen Property in the Fourth Degree (Penal Law §165.45[2]), Identity Theft in the Third Degree (Penal Law §190.78), Unlawful Possession of Personal Identifying Information in the Third Degree (Penal Law §190.81), three counts of Petit Larceny (Penal Law §155.25), Criminal Possession of Stolen Property in the Fifth Degree (Penal Law §165.40), Auto Stripping in the Third Degree (Penal Law §165.09), and Criminal Mischief in the Fourth Degree (Penal Law §145.00[1]). As set forth in the Indictment, it is alleged that, on or about September 12, 2018, Defendant, in Westchester County, New York, entered or remained unlawfully in a premises with intent to

commit a crime therein; stole property belonging to another; did unlawfully remove or destroy parts of a vehicle, and did damage property of another. It is also alleged that, on or about December 16, 2016, Defendant, in Westchester County, New York, entered or remained unlawfully in a premises with intent to commit a crime therein, and stole property belonging to another valued in excess of \$1,000.00. It is further alleged in the indictment that, on or about May 18, 2018, Defendant, in Westchester County, New York, attempted to enter or remain unlawfully in a building with intent to commit a crime therein; stole property belonging to another valued in excess of \$1,000.00 and possessed said property; with intent to defraud, assumed the identity of another person, represented himself as that person and thereby obtained property of said person; unlawfully possessed personal identifying information of such person; stole property belonging to two other persons; and, knowing it was stolen, possessed property stolen from and belonging to another person.

By Notice of Motion dated December 4, 2020, with accompanying Affirmation, Defendant moves for omnibus relief. In response, the People have submitted an Affirmation in Opposition dated December 22, 2020.

The motion is disposed of as follows:

**A. DISCOVERY AND INSPECTION**

Defendant's motion for discovery is granted to the extent provided for in Criminal Procedure Law Article 245 and/or already provided by the People. If any items set forth in CPL Article 245 have not already been provided to Defendant pursuant to that Article, said items are to be provided forthwith. Any party is granted leave, if required, to apply for a Protective Order in compliance with CPL Article 245, upon notice to the opposing party and any party affected by said Protective Order. The People are directed to file a Certificate of Compliance with CPL Article 245 and the instant Order upon completion of their obligations thereunder, if they have not already done so. The People's cross-motion for reciprocal discovery is likewise granted to the extent provided for in Criminal Procedure Law Article 245, and/or already provided to the People. The People are further reminded that any response to a demand for a bill of particulars by Defendant shall adequately inform Defendant of the substance of the alleged conduct, and in all respects comply with CPL Article 245 and §200.95, within 15 days of the date of the request.

In addition, pursuant to Administrative Order 393/19, it is **ORDERED** that the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney responsible for the case, are required to make timely disclosure of information favorable to the defense as

required by *Brady v Maryland*, 373 US 83 [1963]; *Giglio v United States*, 405 US 150 [1972]; *People v Geaslen*, 54 NY2d 510 [1981]; and their progeny under the United States and New York State Constitutions and by Rule 3.8(b) of the New York State Rules of Professional Conduct; and it is further

**ORDERED**, that the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney responsible for the case or, if the matter is not being prosecuted by the District Attorney, the prosecuting agency and its assigned representatives, have a duty to learn of such favorable information that is known to others acting on the government's behalf in the case, including the police, and are therefore expected to confer with investigative and prosecutorial personnel who acted in the case and to review all files which are directly related to the prosecution or investigation of this case. For purposes of this Order, favorable information can include but is not limited to:

a) Information that impeaches the credibility of a testifying prosecution witness, including (I) benefits, promises, or inducements, express or tacit, made to a witness by a law enforcement official or law enforcement victim services agency in connection with giving testimony or cooperating in the case;

(ii) a witness's prior inconsistent statements, written or oral;

(iii) a witness's prior convictions and uncharged criminal

conduct;

(iv) information that tends to show that a witness has a motive to lie to inculcate the defendant, or a bias against the defendant or in favor of the complainant or the prosecution; and

(v) information that tends to show impairment of a witness's ability to perceive, recall, or recount relevant events, including impairment resulting from mental or physical illness or substance abuse;

b) Information that tends to exculpate, reduce the degree of an offense, or support a potential defense to a charged offense;

c) Information that tends to mitigate the degree of the defendant's culpability as to a charged offense. or to mitigate punishment;

d) Information that tends to undermine evidence of the defendant's identity as a perpetrator of a charged crime, such as a non-identification of the defendant by a witness to a charged crime or an identification or other evidence implicating another person in a manner that tends to cast doubt on the defendant's guilt; and

e) Information that could affect in the defendant's favor the ultimate decision on a suppression motion; and it is further

**ORDERED**, that the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney responsible for the case or any other agent

prosecuting the case is hereby advised of his/her duty to disclose favorable information whether or not such information is recorded in tangible form and irrespective of whether the prosecutor credits the information; and it is further

**ORDERED**, that the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney responsible for the case or any other agent responsible for the prosecution of the case is directed that favorable information must be timely disclosed in accordance with the United States and New York State constitutional standards, as well as CPL Article 245. Disclosures are presumptively "timely" if they are completed no later than 30 days before commencement of trial in a felony case and 15 days before commencement of trial in a misdemeanor case. Records of a judgment of conviction or a pending criminal action ordinarily are discoverable within the time frame provided in CPL Article 245. Disclosures that pertain to a suppression hearing are presumptively "timely" if they are made no later than 15 days before the scheduled hearing date; and it is further

**ORDERED**, that the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney responsible for the case or any other agent responsible for the prosecution of the case is hereby reminded and informed that his/her obligation to disclose is a continuing one; and it is further

**ORDERED**, notwithstanding the foregoing, that a prosecutor

may apply for a protective order, which may be issued for good cause, and CPL Article 245 shall be deemed to apply, with respect to disclosures required under this Order. Moreover, the prosecutor may request a ruling from the court on the need for disclosure. Only willful and deliberate conduct will constitute a violation of this Order or be eligible to result in personal sanctions against a prosecutor; and it is further

**ORDERED**, that counsel for the defendant is required to:

a) confer with the defendant about his/her case and is required to keep the defendant informed about all significant developments in the case; and

b) timely communicate any and all plea offers to the defendant and to provide him/her with reasonable advice about the advantages and disadvantages of any such plea offer including the potential sentencing ranges that apply in the case;

c) where applicable, insure the defendant receives competent advice concerning immigration consequences as required under *Padilla v Kentucky*, 559 US 356 [2010];

d) perform a reasonable investigation of the facts and the law pertinent to the case (including, as applicable, visiting the scene, interviewing witnesses, subpoenaing pertinent materials, consulting experts; inspecting exhibits, reviewing all discovery materials obtained from the prosecution, researching legal issues, etc.) or, as appropriate, making a reasonable



professional judgment not to investigate a particular matter;

e) comply with the requirements of the New York State Rules of Professional Conduct regarding conflicts of interest, and when appropriate, timely notify the court of a possible conflict so that an inquiry may be undertaken or a ruling made;

f) possess or acquire a reasonable knowledge and familiarity with criminal procedural and evidentiary law to ensure constitutionally effective representation in the case; and

g) in accordance with statute, provide notices as specified in CPL sections 250.10, 250.20 and 250.30. (e.g., a demand, intent to introduce the evidence, etc.)

**B. MOTION TO SUPPRESS IDENTIFICATION/FOR A WADE HEARING**

A review of the Indictment and attached Notices indicates that, pursuant to CPL §710.20(3), the People served Defendant with notice of an identification procedure, namely several photo-arrays. Defendant asserts that there were constitutional improprieties in the identification procedures employed to identify him. The People argue that the showing here of several photo-arrays was not unduly suggestive. They also assert that, in any event, the witness had an independent source for the identifications. The People do, however, consent to a hearing. Consequently, a hearing is ordered, first to determine whether the noticed identification procedures were unduly suggestive (*United States v Wade*, 388 US 218 [1967]).

Specifically, the court shall determine whether the identification procedures were so improperly suggestive as to taint any in-court identification. In the event the identification procedures are found to be unduly suggestive, the court shall then go on to consider whether the People have proven that an independent source exists for each witness' proposed in-court identification.

**C. MOTION FOR A HUNTLEY HEARING**

Defendant moves, pursuant to CPL §710.20(3), to suppress noticed statements. The People, in their Affirmation in Opposition, state that there were no improprieties regarding acquisition of the statements attributable to Defendant. However, they do consent to a hearing. Consequently, the motion to suppress noticed statements is granted to the extent that a pre-trial *Huntley/Dunaway* hearing is ordered.

**D. MOTION TO INSPECT THE GRAND JURY MINUTES  
AND TO DISMISS AND/OR REDUCE THE INDICTMENT**

Defendant moves pursuant to CPL §§210.20(1)(b) and © to dismiss the indictment, or counts thereof, on the grounds that the evidence before the Grand Jury was legally insufficient and that the Grand Jury proceeding was defective within the meaning of CPL §210.35. The Court has reviewed the minutes of the proceedings before the Grand Jury.

Pursuant to CPL §190.65(1), an indictment must be supported

by legally sufficient evidence which establishes that the defendant committed the offenses charged. Legally sufficient evidence is competent evidence which, if accepted as true, would establish each and every element of the offense charged and the defendant's commission thereof (CPL §70.10[1]); *People v Jennings*, 69 NY2d 103 [1986]). "In the context of a grand jury proceeding, legal sufficiency means prima facie proof of the crimes charged, not proof beyond a reasonable doubt." *People v Bello*, 92 NY2d 523 (1998); *People v Ackies*, 79 AD3d 1050 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dept 2010). In rendering a determination, "[t]he reviewing court's inquiry is limited to whether the facts, if proven, and the inferences that logically flow from those facts supply proof of each element of the charged crimes and whether the grand jury could rationally have drawn the inference of guilt." *Bello*, supra, quoting *People v Boampong*, 57 AD3d 794 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dept 2008-- internal quotations omitted).

A review of the minutes reveals that the evidence presented, if accepted as true, would be legally sufficient to establish every element of the offenses charged (see CPL §210.30[2]). Accordingly, Defendant's motion to dismiss or reduce for lack of sufficient evidence is denied.

With respect to Defendant's claim that the Grand Jury proceeding was defective within the meaning of CPL §210.35, a review of the minutes supports a finding that a quorum of the

grand jurors was present during the presentation of evidence and at the time the district attorney instructed the Grand Jury on the law, that the grand jurors who voted to indict heard all the "essential and critical evidence" (see *People v Collier*, 72 NY2d 298 [1988]; *People v Julius*, 300 AD2d 167 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2002], lv den 99 NY2d 655 [2003]), and that the Grand Jury was properly instructed (see *People v Calbud*, 49 NY2d 389 [1980] and *People v. Valles*, 62 NY2d 36 [1984]).

In making this determination, the Court does not find that release of such portions of the Grand Jury minutes as have not already been disclosed pursuant to CPL Article 245 to the parties was necessary to assist the Court.

**E. MOTION FOR SANDOVAL/VENTIMIGLIA/MOLINEUX HEARING**

Granted, solely to the extent that *Sandoval/Ventimiglia/Molineux* hearings, as the case may be, shall be held immediately prior to trial, as follows:

A. Pursuant to CPL §245.20, the People must notify the Defendant, not less than fifteen days prior to the first scheduled date for trial, of all specific instances of Defendant's uncharged misconduct and criminal acts of which the People have knowledge and which the People intend to use at trial for purposes of impeaching the credibility of the Defendant, or as substantive proof of any material issue in the case, designating, as the case may be for each act or acts, the

intended use (impeachment or substantive proof) for which the act or acts will be offered; and

B. Defendant, at the ordered hearing, must then sustain his burden of informing the Court of the prior misconduct which might unfairly affect him as a witness in his own behalf (see, *People v. Malphurs*, 111 AD2d 266 [2<sup>nd</sup> Dept. 1985]).

All other motions are denied.

Dated: White Plains, New York  
January 7, 2021



---

HON. DAVID S. ZUCKERMAN, A.J.S.C.

HON. ANTHONY A. SCARPINO, JR.  
District Attorney, Westchester County  
111 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.  
White Plains, New York 10601  
BY: Pavel Williams, Esq.  
Assistant District Attorney

S. KEN JONES, ESQ.  
Office of Clare J. Degnan,  
Legal Aid Society of Westchester County  
Attorney for Defendant  
150 Grand Street, Suite 100  
White Plains, NY 10601