A-2039-0674

25

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY 1 ESSEX COUNTY LAW DIVISION, CRIMINAL PART 2 INDICTMENT NO. 03-6-2254 APP. DIV. NO. A-2039-06 3 RECEIVED 4 STATE OF NEW JERSEY, APPELLATE DIVISION 5 Plaintiff FILED SEP 14 2007 APPELLATE DIVISION TRANSCRIPT 6 SUPERIOR COURT 7 SENTENCING ISEP # 4 2007 OF NEW JERSEY LUIS DASILVA, 8 9 Place: County Court House 10 50 W. Market Street 11 Newark, NJ 07102 12 August 4, 2004 Date: 13 BEFORE: 14 HONORABLE PETER J. VASQUEZ, J.S.C. 15 TRANSCRIPT OF DERED BY: 16 ED GERMADNIG, (Office of the Public Defender) 17 APPEARANCES: 18 19 THOMAS MCTIGUE, ESQ. (Assistant Prosecutor) Attorney for plaintiff 20 RONALD S. SAMPSON, ESQ. (Pope Bergrin & Verdesco, PA) 21 Attorney for defendant TRANSCRIBER JEAN MIRZA 22 G & L TRANSCRIPTION OF NJ 23 40 Evans Place Pompton Plains, NJ 07444 24 Audio Recorded

Racorded by: Not Identified

INDEX

1	ARGUMENT	PAGE
2	Mr. Sampson	5, 25
3	Mr. McTigue	18, 2
4	STATEMENT	
5	Mr. C. Chohinin	13
6	Mr. F. Chohinin	17
7	SENTENCING	
8	The Court	27
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		

1	THE COURT: Luis F. Dasilva, indictment 3-6-
2	2254. Appearances for the record.
3	MR. MCTIGUE: Assistant Prosecutor, Thomas
4	McTigue, appearing on behalf of the State, Your Honor.
5	MR. SAMPSON: Ronald S. Sampson, on behalf
6	of the defendant, Luis Dasilva.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Sampson, did you have an
8	opportunity to review the PSI with your client?
9	MR. SAMPSON: Yes, Your Honor, we have, we
10	have reviewed it at length. There are, perhaps, two
11	corrections which should be made, Your Honor.
12	The first has to do with the defendant's
13	prior criminal history. There is a notation in the
14	body of the report which reflects five arrests, Your
15	Honor. I believe that is an error.
16	It lists an arrest of May (th, 2003 in
17	Belleville. Your Honor, I believe that
18	THE COURT: That was for this offense.
19	MR. SAMPSON: That was this offense, Judge.
20	And, therefore, I believe the number of arrests should
21	be four, as opposed to the five reflected in the body
22	of the report.
23	In addition, Your Honor, as I indicated
24	earlier, in the body of the report, the probation
25	officer sets forth a version of the events which are

the -- which were the subject of the trial.

I would only indicate, Your Honor, because I believe that the reference as to -- where Mr. Chohinin (phonetic) made the last pick up and drop off, that is from Woodside Avenue to Niagara Street (phonetic) is at -- varies (phonetic) with the testimony at trial. It's not a critical point, Judge, but I think it should be noted for the record.

MR. MCTIGUE: Judge, with regard to the arrest, I think Your Honor will recall from the trial that the initial arrest of Mr. Dasilva was for a CDS paraphernalia charge by New York City Detectives and Belleville Police Officers.

Based upon that arrest and other circumstances known to them, he was subsequently brought to the Belleville Police Station where he was identified and found that there was an open homicide warrant for him.

It's a small technical point, Judge, but there were legally two arrests on that day.

THE COURT: Technically, you are correct.

So we'll leave it at five. Mr. Sampson, do you wish
to be heard?

MR. SAMPSON: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, the events that bring us here to court today are,

indeed, tragic. They are tragic for the family of the victim, as well as for the defendant and his family.

Some of whom are present here in court today.

Your Honor, the court is aware, from the presentence investigation report, as well as the testimony at trial, that this defendant, Mr. Dasilva, at the present time is 23 years of age. That he has no juvenile history that we are aware of. And, heretofore, he has no prior criminal convictions.

Judge, it seems very surprising that an individual with a strong work history, who has close family ties, who is the father of a young child, as is Mr. Dasilva, who has a strong employment history and comes from a stable and supportive family -- would find himself not only charged but convicted of, perhaps, the most serious offense in our criminal justice system.

I would only indicate, Judge, that in assessing Mr. Dasilva that the court consider while he has had some involvement with the criminal justice system, as the Court has noted, technically five prior arrests. The Court should also note that he has no convictions.

That he has successfully completed a PTI program, a program of diversion in the state of New

1 | Jersey. And that the other matters that were the subject of arrests were all administratively dismissed by the prosecutor's office.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we believe, Judge, they should be of no -- no weight in this matter. They do constitute arrests, but since they are not convictions and were dismissed, that the court should not give them any undue weight.

Judge, in assessing what would be a fair sentence in this matter, Your Honor, we would ask the Court to consider several points.

At trial, Your Monor, he has been convicted of a number of offenses. The felony murder, murder, robbery, the unlawful possession of a weapon in the third degree, second degree possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, and third degree receiving scolen property.

Judge, as we discussed prior to the beginning of this sentencing procedure, it is the defense's position that under 20:1-8(a), and the tests set forth by Blockburger vs. United States, United States Supreme Court case, that a number of these offenses, in fact, merge for purposes of sentencing.

We would respectfully submit, Your Honor, that the murder charge would merge into the felony

murder offense. That the first-degree robbery would merge into the felony murder offense.

And we believe also, Your Honor, that the second-degree possession of a weapon for unlawful purposes would also merge with the other -- with those other counts -- felony murder and robbery offenses (phonetic).

In assessing, Judge, what would be a fair and reasonable sentence in this matter, Your Honor, we would ask that the Court consider, as the Court is well aware, that it -- aggravating and mitigating factors in this case.

In terms of the aggravating factors, Judge, clearly given the gravity of the charge and the conviction against Mr. Dasilva, we understand that the Court is going to consider the risks that the defendant will commit another offense.

We would also expect that the Court would consider factor number nine, the need for deterring the defendant and others from violating the law.

Ordinarily, Judge, we would also expect that factor six would be considered, but he has no prior record, Judge. There's nothing about his past that would indicate that he's likely to be back here.

We believe, Judge, under all the

circumstances, that those are the proper aggravating factors for the Court to consider.

We would also suggest, most respectfully,

Your Honor, that the absence of any prior involvement
with the criminal justice system by this defendant is
a mitigating factor that the Court should consider. I
do anticipate that the assistant prosecutor will refer
again to the number of prior arrests.

Since they have not resulted in any convictions, and that the defendant has previously completed a course of pretrial intervention, Your Honor, I believe that that mitigating factor, the absence of any prior convictions, should be considered.

Judge, with regard to the other factors, the other counts for which the defendant stands convicted, that is the third degree receiving stolen property, as well as the third degree unlawful possession of a handgun.

Your Honor, we believe that -- imposing sentence, we would respectfully request that the Court impose concurrent sentences on those charges.

to the proper test -- under <u>Blockburger</u> and the merger now -- 2C:1-8(a). Your Honor, we certainly understand

that under our system of justice, there's no such thing as a free crime.

1.6

However, Your Honor, we would respectfully submit that the possession of a handgun and -- the possession of the handgun is such an integral part of the offenses charged to this defendant under the indictment and under the charges under which he has been convicted, Your Honor, that it would be essentially unfair to impose a separate sentence for that offense.

Certainly, Judge, one of the factors the Court -- consider and that is whether or not in, in and of itself, is a separate crime of violence. It's not, Judge, it's a possessory offense. And while, in fact, it possesses the potential for violence, it is not, in and of itself, a violent offense. And, therefore, Judge, we don't believe that a separate sentence would be fair.

And given, Your Honor, the gravity of the sentence that the Court is duty bound to impose upon this defendant for his conviction under the felony murder offense, Your Honor, we don't believe that -- we don't believe that a separate consecutive sentence is warranted.

Judge, when you consider all the factors in

this case, we certainly understand that the defendant is facing a minimum 30 year jail sentence.

And Your Honor, we can certainly never downplay the seriousness of the offense that the defendant stands convicted of, Your Honor. It's felony murder, it's a conviction for taking a human life. And there's certainly nothing -- no offense that's more serious than that, Judge.

But we would urge the Court to consider that

-- imposing sentence, that the sentence that the Court

impose should be consistent with other sentences for

people similarly situated as this defendant.

And given that this defendant has no prior history, that he has -- that he stands not even charged with any prior offense of violence, there's no -- there is nothing, Judge, there's naching in his record heretofore that would indicate that he would be here facing these charges, Judge (phonetic).

Given his relative youth, Judge, at this point he's still 23 years of age, the minimum mandatory sentence of 30 years, Your Honor, is -- is -- is an extreme amount of time, Judge. I know these are extreme circumstances. I know this is an extreme offense.

But given all the Court knows about this

case and -- and this defendant, Your Honor, we believe that -- that the minimum sentence, the 30 years without parole, is a fair and just sentence in this matter. And we would ask that the Court impose that.

This is a young man who, at some point, will -- will be back in society. He does have, Judge, despite the seriousness of these charges and despite the fact that maybe during the trial it did not seem that he had much support, he does have family members here in court with him today, Judge.

He does have a one-year-old son who is, in fact, a United States citizen and will be returning to this country and (phonetic) who would still like, at some point, to resume a relationship with his father, the defendant.

So we would respectfully reguest that the court in imposing the sentence consider all of these factors. We certainly know that there's nothing that can be done to bring Mr. Chohinin back. We certainly know that there is nothing the court here can do to -- to placate the family or make the family feel better about this.

But we do believe, Judge, that, as set forth by the legislature, a sentence of 30 years in one of our maximum-security prisons is a fair and reasonable sentence under all the circumstances.

1 |

And we would respectfully request that the Court temper justice with mercy and to not, in effect, pile on. I know he's got several charges here, Judge, many of them merge.

The concept of merger -- is one that the legislature has -- has enacted, Judge. It's certainly -- it certainly is the law. And the sentence that the Court can impose is directed by the legislature.

So it is not, Your Honor, and cannot be fairly said that the defendant would be getting away with anything, or getting a free ride. Your Honor, the sentence that the Court imposes, even at 30 years without parole, is a devastating blow to anyone.

Taking 30 years out of a man's life is a -is a severe punishment. And I know the rejoinder
would be that nothing will bring back Mr. Chohinin and
we understand that, Judge, and that's not our point.

The point simply is that under our system, that the proposed sentence of 36 years is what the legislature envisioned. And we would ask the Court, sentence the defendant accordingly. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else from the defense?
MR. SAMPSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. McTigue?

MR. MCTIGUE: Yes, Judge, with the Court's 1 permission, before I make my comments to the court, 2 there are two family members, Mr. Chohinin's father 3 and uncle who wish to address the Court. THE COURT: Before we do that, I said 5 anything else from the defense. But, specifically, 6 did the defendant want to speak or not? 7 MR. SAMPSON: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. Okay, go ahead, Mr. 9 McTigue. 10 11 MR. MCTIGUE: Thank you. THE COURT: Please have him put his name on 12 the record. 13 (Interpreter utilized for statement, 14 interpreter not identified) 15 MR. C. CHOHININ: My name is Clever 16 17 (phonetic) Chohinin. I come from Ecuador. I am the 18 uncle of the victim. Honorable Judge Vasquez, Judge of this 19 20 criminal case -- distinguished prosecutor, Thomas 21 McTigue, prosecutor of this case -- police authorities who are present here -- member of the press --22 Hispanic community here present -- Latin American 23 friends, Ecuadorian friends -- dear family -- ladies 24

25

and gentlemen.

I would like to express a few words as to this event that has destroyed our families and broken our spirits. Due to the heinous homicide committed against my nephew, Felix Leonardo (phonetic) Chohinin -- I would like to say to you honorable people present here -- this was -- this has to do with a child that was born in -- Province of Loha (phonetic) -- city, which belongs to our dear Ecuador. For those who do not know where Macara (phonetic) is located, it's next to the country of Peru.

He was a happy child. He was to be playful and mischievous as any other child in my country. He grew quickly. His primary and secondary education was imparted by -- through the brethren of -- Hermanos Maristas (phonetic). These are Brothers that come from Spain.

He was taught to love his neighbor. To follow the logical rules of justice. The law of studies and love of work. He grew under the protection of his parents and relatives.

He soon became a man of good. He married a nice young lady. And he -- had a son who is three years old at the moment.

But he wanted to improve his way of life.

And he wanted to come to this great country up North

(phonetic). By that time, his father already was living here in this country of North America.

I will never forget the day which he called his father over the phone -- asking him to bring him to this land -- Abraham Lincoln's land.

And I remember when he told him -- father, take me -- because I would like to build the -- I would like to build the ladder that leads to success. And he brought him here, he came. Because he wanted to study and to work -- in order to support his family.

But, unfortunately, on November the 4th,

2002, in a -- in the wee hours of the morning, on a

very cold morning on this date -- someone took his

life. In his prime youth, when he was starting to

live.

For such a reason, Your Konor, and people present here -- I have come to this great country to be a witness of this legal process -- and for this act not to go unpunished.

I want a sentence -- that the sentence that is imposed would be an example. As member of a Catholic family -- we know that the creator of all things already has a punishment for him.

Honorable Justice Vasquez, I will receive

whatever -- whatever decision you impose and we hope that that decision would be exemplary. And that would be sort of a relief for the pain that we are bearing.

I would also like to take advantage of this opportunity -- to greatly thank the prosecutor, Mr.

Thomas McTigue -- for the great way in which he conducted the process. Proving step by step the --all the details involved in the case -- in the crime. So the members of the jury would see and find him guilty.

I would like to express my infinite

gratitude to them -- to the police authorities, to the

detectives -- and in a very, very special way to

Nicole Berian (phonetic). I'm very thankful to you.

Because I know you took this case seriously. Because

this also broke your heart. May God Feward you.

And, of course, how will I not thank the members of the press, I think that Univision is present here -- who projected the photograph of my nephew and made it possible for the criminal to be captured.

My formal thanks to Juan Rodriguez also -from the Department of Victims of Crimes -- who has
supported us psychogogically -- as a man of faith, the
Christian faith -- may God reward you.

1,

And all the Hispanic friends -- who were helping my brother through this pain -- I only have to say thank and proceed with the justice and may the powerful God protect you. That's all.

THE COURT: Thank you for your eloquence, Mr. Chohinin.

MR. F. CHOHININ: My name is Felix Chohinin. Father of the victim. First of all, I would like to greet the Honorable Vasquez -- the Court, the Hispanic community here present. I would first like to thank you, Your Honor, for the way you conducted the case.

Mr. McTigue, Nicole, Juan -- Juan Rodriguez, and all of you.

On the November -- in the early hours of the morning of November the 4th, 2002, it was -- a heartbreaking case when I received the news about my son. A case which shattered my life.

As of that day, my life has changed, my family's life has changed -- my son's life, who is seven years old (phonetic). I don't have words to express the pain I feel. I'll be a little short about my son's biography.

I, as my brother said, my child was raised under people that believe in God. We taught him to work, we taught him to love his neighbor, to love God,

but the same way God gave him to me, God also has taken him away from me.

I ask you for the most severe sentence. Why the most severe? Because I wouldn't like any parent to go through what I'm going through. Why severe? Because I have a seven-year-old son and I would like him to grow securely. And I want the criminals that easily take other people's lives to be where they have to be.

I would like to be short -- and I thank all this Court, the press -- Univision -- who never forgot about me, they were always there. And specifically, as my brother said, to Mr. McTigue, Nicole, who I will always have in my heart. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chohinin. Mc. McTigue?

MR. MCTIGUE: Yes. Your Honor presided over this case, and it's unusual, I think, when we get a feel for a victim as much as we have here.

Felix Chohinin is not physically in this courtroom, but through the comments that Your Hoper just heard, we know Felix Chohinin. We know him through the warmth expressed by his co-workers, their feelings for him during the trial.

We know him through the tremendous dignity

with which his parents carried themselves through the ordeal of the trial that they attended each and every day, through all the difficult details.

Judge, this was a vicious and senseless killing. The jury convicted the defendant not only of knowing and purposely murder (phonetic), but felony murder.

We know from the testimony during the trial that the decedent, Felix Chohinin, was shot in the back of the head with no provocation -- merely as he was applying his trade, that of a livery cab driver in the city of Newark, New Jersey.

We know from testimony, Judge, that his still living body was dragged from that cab and, thereafter, he was robbed.

His life was taken, the proceeds that he had earned by the sweat of his brow -- and the DVD player that was his pride and joy that he showed off to his friends earlier that night.

I mention these facts, Judge, as part of the aggravating factors. Certainly, the Court must consider the nature of the offense and details therein.

We're cautioned by the Appellate Courts not to double count. But, certainly, Judge, I think you can consider the callousness and the absolute horror of this senseless act -- perpetrated by a man who doesn't come to you as a person deprived of his childhood. He had advantages, Judge, that many defendants who appear before you do not have. He had education, a stable family.

But somewhere in the defendant's life,

Judge, he took a wrong turn. And as he was making

that turn, unfortunately, the person he ran into was

the man whose life he took.

There is a certain horror about this crime, Judge, simply because of its -- just because of the nature of it and how a person going about his daily work, doing no wrong, the randomness of it, Judge -- is shocking in and of itself.

What's also shocking, Judge, is the fact that it appears that the defendant who has a lovel of intelligence, we know that from his testimony on the stand, has perverted that intelligence. This crime bespoke a certain level of planning. There was a calculated nature to it. There was an escape route, there was a plan in effect where he could take the can that was driven by the decedent and leave.

We know from the behavior of the defendant after this crime was committed. He took steps to send

1 his wife and child to their native Brazil. He disguised his appearance. He abused the trust of people who extended kindness to him in the Hispanic community by sheltering him. And he only came to the surface, Judge, when, with the help of the media, he was flushed from his hideout by the publicity that was engendered by this case.

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, Judge, I mention these as contributing to the overall gravity of the crime inflicted here and the nature of the defendant.

Your Honor had the chance to see the defendant on the stand. He has expressed no remorse. Understanding that he denies his guilt of this crime, there is no remorse whatsoever, Judge. Not to the general situation, not for the family of the victim.

There are other aggravating factors which apply, Judge, with equal force. Certainly, Judge, there is a risk that this defendant will commit another crime. How do we know that? Well, Judge, he was committing crimes up to and including the trial of this case.

During the trial of this case, Your Honor heard testimony about threats he made to a witness. Which may be the subject of additional charges, which the prosecution will weigh in the future as to whether those charges should be lodged. But through the trial, he continued in his criminal conduct -- trying to escape the ultimate power of the jury.

He does pose a risk to society, Judge. And as Mr. Sampson noted, at some point he will be back in society. And given the path he has chosen in life, Judge, and given the choices he has made, I would submit that society would be best served by not having him in its presence.

Certainly, there is a need to deter. And,

Judge, I firmly believe that, given this defendant,

given his nature, the only thing that will deter him

from further illegal conduct, from further violence is
a long custodial term.

Your Honor, Mr. Sampson has made his comments regarding merger. I agree with him, theirs the law. Certainly, the --

THE COURT: Can T interrupt one second, Mr.

McTigue -- in that context, Mr. Sampson suggested that
everything merges into felony murder. Originally, T
had indicated that felony murder merges into murder.

Do you take the position that everything merges into Count One or that Count One merges into Count Two?

MR. MCTIGUE: Judge, I believe the felony

murder would merge with the knowing and purposeful murder. I believe the robbery would merge into the felony murder.

THE COURT: Continue.

MR. MCTIGUE: Thank you. With regard to the possession of the gun charge, Judge, I would submit that that does not merge and that there should be a consecutive sentence imposed in that case.

We know from testimony at trial, that was a gun that was stolen from a Newark Police Officer. And we know that months after the killing of Felix Chohinin, that gun was sold by the defendant to another person for \$300.

This is a separate regulatory offense,

Judge. It stands on its own. There is sufficient

evidence before this Court to indicate that the

defendant possessed that gun, not only on the day of

the murder, but at a time -- for a significant period

of time before the murder and for a significant period

of time after the murder. At which time he sold it by

way of getting rid of evidence.

I would respectfully submit that sentence to be imposed on that Count should be consecutive, not concurrent, to the sentence to be imposed by Your Honor on the homicide counts.

Likewise, Judge, the receiving stolen
property, which was the gun, should run consecutive to
the homicide counts.

I will conceded that an argument may be made that if Your Honor imposes a consecutive sentence for possession of the gun, that the un -- that the receiving stolen property count perhaps run concurrent to there to. But they do involve separate crimes, one is regulatory and the other possessory crime.

Your Honor has a range of sentencing before you. Certainly, the defendant must serve a minimum of 30 years without parole. But the homicide statute provides that the sentence which may be imposed for a murder is between 30 years and life.

Just looking at the aggravating factors.

Judge, and the mitigating factors, to the extent Your

Honor credits any of the mitigating factors, I would

respectfully submit that within the nature of this

offense, given the factors known to Your Honor as

developed through the trial, the aggravating factors

overwhelm any mitigating factors which may exist.

I think Your Honor can reasonably impose a sentence higher than 30 years for this offense. It's the State's position that a term of 50 years, subject to the No Early Release Act, be imposed on the

homicide Counts.

With the Counts -- with the sentences to be imposed on the Counts for possession of a weapon and receiving stolen property -- running consecutive to the homicide sentence, and consecutive to each other.

MR. SAMPSON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Sampson?

MR. SAMPSON: Judge, just -- just one point, please. With regard to the aggravating and mitigating -- we certainly concede that -- that the death of Mr. Chohinin was -- was horrible and -- committed a callous act.

I believe the burden on the State under the -- under the law would be that there is something about this particular offense that is especially heinous, cruel or deprayed. And I believe that would be the standard, Judge.

And I only point out with regard to any threats made by this defendant that, of all the charges against him, the only two in which he was acquitted were the terroristic threats and the witness tampering, Judge.

And so I believe that the State is probably barred by virtue of a rule on double jeopardy for reindicting him on those charges.

Nonetheless, Judge, I don't believe that -the risk of committing another offense, nor the need
to deter so preponderate over the one mitigating
factor we suggested as to warrant above the
presumptive 30 year term.

And, that would just be out point. Thank you.

MR. MCTIGUE: To reply very briefly, Judge.

Mr. Sampson correctly points out that there was a

terroristic threat and tampering charge in the

indictment, for which he was acquitted. That involved

one witness for this case, Alex Tixy (phonetic).

Your Honor will recall, when the case was being tried, within the precincts of this courtroom, this defendant threatened another witness, Carlos Marquines (phonetic).

And he did so, Judge, in a fashion typical to what I would characterize as his "egomaniac." He chose to threaten Mr. Marquines, speaking in Spanish and Portuguese. Not counting on the fact that there would be a Spanish-speaking court officer in the vicinity.

He thought he was threatening in anonymity,

Judge. Unfortunately for him, it turned out

differently. And that is a viable charge, Judge,

which is not in any way touched by principles of double jeopardy.

And it remains a decision for the prosecutor's office to make as to whether additional charges will be lodged in connection with that separate incident, which occurred in this courtroom.

THE COURT: Anything else?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: On June 22nd of this year, Mr.

Dasilva was found guilty of felony murder, purposeful and knowing murder, first-degree robbery, unlawful possession of a weapon, possession of a weapon for unlawful purpose and receiving stolen property. A guilty verdict was returned by a trial jury after two weeks of trial.

I am familiar with the particent facts of the case since I presided over that trial. And I have also reviewed the presentence report. Listened to the statements made by the people who spoke today.

And also should mention that the Court received a letter with an accompanying translation from -- Mario Calderone (phonetic) Bohokef (phonetic), provincial councilman (phonetic) from Ecuador.

Based on my review of the presentence investigation report, and testimony at trial, I am

familiar with Mr. Dasilva's background. Born August 25, 1980 in South Paolo Brazil. Attended school in Brazil and also attended, apparently, high school in New Jersey. There was no record of any juvenile -- they have no juvenile record of him. As an adult, as has already been commented, there's a record of five arrests but this is his first indictable conviction.

That being the case, he is entitled to mitigating factor number seven because of no prior convictions.

As aggravating factors, aggravating factor number one, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the role of the actor therein, including whether or not it was committed in an especially heinous, cruel or deprayed manner.

People can differ as to what a heinous, cruel and depraved, I'm not so much going or say that aggravating factor number one applies as to indicating the fact that I'm considering the way that this incident occurred -- in considering what penalties should be given.

Certainly, factors three and nine all concede -- apply. Three, the risk that he'll commit another offense. Based on his actions -- I have seen through the trial, and based on his history of

arrests. And nine, the need to deter him and others from violating the law.

Back to the offense itself. This was a planned, cold blooded -- execution, really -- of a defenseless young man trying to make a living.

The defendant took with him a handgun with the purpose of using it to rob and kill his victim so that there would not be a witness to identify him. He shot him in the back of the head, execution style. The victim was defenseless. Certainly there was no provocation on the part of the victim.

I think the prosecutor is accurate in using the words "vicious and senseless" killing. Or, perhaps, not senseless in the defendant's opinion since it was obvious to this Court that the killing was not only to facilitate the robbery, but to facilitate his escape and not being apprehended for same.

This is conduct that, in the scheme of things, is not your mildest murder, if any murder can be considered a mild murder or low on the scale of murder, because none really can. But there are certain murders that are more vicious than others.

And this is one that is more vicious than others.

I recognize the -- that this is his first

conviction and, therefore, obviously, his first violent conviction. And that must be considered and considered heavily by the Court.

There is no presumptive term for murder.

But in the grand scheme of things, our legislature has given us a very wide range from 30 years to life, with life being presumed to be a 75-year period. Or -- 75 (phonetic).

Where does this fall in that scale. I don't think it would be -- far off to say it certainly was at least half way up the scale. And I don't think the State's request or recommendation that a sentence of 50 years is appropriate (phonetic), is off the mark by much.

Considering both the viciousness of the act itself, but weighing that against the lack of a prior criminal history, I still find that the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors.

Nevertheless, I'm going to sentence as follows. First of all, on Count One where he is found guilty of first-degree felony murder, we are merging that with Count Two. Purposeful and knowing murder.

Count Three, where he is found guilty of first-degree robbery, we are merging with Count One, felony murder.

And Count Five where he is found guilty of second-degree possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose; we're merging with Count Two, purposeful and knowing murder.

1.2

And on Count Two, which he was charged with purposeful and knowing murder, found guilty of same by the jury in this case, Mr. Dasilva -- you are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections for a term of 45 years.

This is an offense under the No Early

Release Act and, accordingly, 85 percent of that time

would be parole ineligible. It's obvious from the

testimony and the guilty verdict from the jury that

the Graves Act would also apply.

There is a Safe Neighborhood Assessment of \$75 and a Violent Crimes Assessment of \$100.

On Count Four of the indictment that charges second-degree unlawful possession of a weapon -- you are sentenced to -- committed to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections for a period of five years.

Safe Neighborhood Assessment of \$75, Violent Crimes of \$50.

And on Count Eight, which charges third degree receiving stolen property, you are committed to

the custody of the Department of Corrections for a term of five years.

Count Four will run consecutive to Count

Two. Count Eight will run concurrent to Counts Two
and Four.

There is a Law Enforcement Training

Assessment of \$30. Jail credit is 458 days, from May

4 of 2003 to August the 3rd of 2004.

Defendant was found not guilty on Count Six and Seven, those Counts are dismissed.

Mr. Dasilva, you do have the right to appeal. Any appeal must be filed within 45 days of your date of sentencing, which is today. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed to represent you. Do you understand your right to appeal?

MR. DASILVA: Yes, I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The aggregate sentence is 50 years. On 45 years, there is a parole ineligibility of 85 percent.

The purpose of this statement is to inform the public of the actual period of time this defendant is likely to spend in jail or prison as a result of this sentence. That actual period of jail or prison time is not determined by this Judge, but by the

1 Statutes of New Jersey as applied to this sentence by 2 the State Parole Board.

In this case, the period of estimated actual custody --

MR. MCTIGUE: Excuse me, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MCTIGUE: May I approach Mr. Sampson?

THE COURT: Sure, you can.

(Attorneys in discussion)

(Recording off)

THE COURT: -- 39 years, three months and five days -- according to the Parole Board's rublished parole eligibility tables. It is an approximate estimate; the estimate assumes that the defendant will get full credit for good time, work time and minimum custody time. All of those credits being provided for by New Jersey Statute. If defendant does not get those credits, the time served will be longer.

Furthermore, if at defendant's parole eligibility date -- the parole board determines that there is a substantial likelihood the defendant will commit a crime if released, parole will be denied at that time.

Presently, more than 40 percent of defendants are not released by the parole board at the

			I
			I
			١
	1		Ì
			ı
	•		ı
	4		١
			ı
	3		I
	J	١.	I
			I
	4	1	١
	7	•	ı
			١
	5	,	I
	_		I
			١
	6	,	١
	Œ		I
			١
	7		١
			I
			I
	8	,	١
			١
	9		I
	2	•	1
			١
1	r	١	ı
-	•	•	١
			١
1	1		١
_	_		I
			١
1	2	1	١
			١
	_		١
1	3	,	١
			I
1	,		١
T	4	٠	١
			١
1	c	:	١
*	*	,	١
			١
1	6	5	١
_			١
_			١
1	7	7	١
			١
	,		ı
1	Ą	5	ı
			١
1	c	١.	١
Ŧ	2	,	١
2	r)	1
-	•	-	1
			Í
2	1		1
-	1		ı
	_		ı
2	2	2	1
			1
2	-		J
-3	1		-1

estimated time in the statement, serving another year or more. The actual calculation can be complex.

But for the majority of the defendants, the total real time that is served for this sentence is approximately what I have stated, namely 39 years, three months and five days.

This defendant has already served 458 days of that time. Defendant should not rely at all on this statement and, in particular, cannot rely on it on appeal. It is intended solely to inform the public.

Also, pursuant to No Early Release Act, there will be a five-year parole provision when he is ultimately released on parole.

There being nothing else?

MR. MCTIGUE: Nothing further, Judge.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. MCTIGUE: Thank you, sir.

(Matter concluded)

24

25

î	I, Jean Mirza, the assigned transcriber, do
2	hereby certify the foregoing transcript of proceedings
3	on tape number 1, index number 1150 to 5099, is
4	prepared in full compliance with the current
5	Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a
6	true and accurate non-compressed transcript of the
7	proceedings as recorded.
8	dla hi
9	8/1/01 year Hoya
10	Date Jeam Mirza, AOC #541 G & L Transcription of NJ
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	