

ANNUAL REPORT



2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
PROSECUTOR'S MESSAGE	3
PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE STAFF	5
APPELLATE UNIT	8
COLLISION ANALYSIS AND RECONSTRUCTION UNIT	11
CIVIL REMEDIES UNIT	13
CRIME SCENE UNIT	15
EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT	16
FAMILY UNIT	17
FINANCIAL CRIMES UNIT	20
GANG, GUN AND NARCOTICS TASK FORCE	24
GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT	30
HIGH-TECH CRIMES/FORENSIC UNIT	32
HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT	36
INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT	37
INSURANCE FRAUD UNIT	37
INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT	39
MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – Special Victims Section	41
MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – Violent Offenders Section	43
PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT	48
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	49
TRIAL UNIT	49
OFFICE OF VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCACY	51
STATISTICAL DATA	54

A MESSAGE FROM PROSECUTOR SCOTT A. COFFINA

I am pleased to release the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office's Annual Report for 2018. I hope you will take the opportunity to review this report and become familiar with the various types of cases we handle and the accomplishments of our talented and dedicated staff in the pursuit of justice and public safety for the residents we proudly serve.

The BCPO handles over 5,000 criminal cases per year, in addition to establishing countywide law enforcement policies, conducting training with our local agency partners, and leading investigations into reported incidents that ultimately do not lead to charges being filed. In 2018, the BCPO's Major Crimes Unit, Violent Crimes Section had a number of successful homicide trials in the aftermath of the spike in violent crime in our County in 2016 & 2017.

Moreover, facing an unprecedented substance use disorder epidemic and a startling spike in fatal overdoses in 2017, the BCPO added resources to our Gang, Gun & Narcotics Task Force ("GGNFT") to enhance our enforcement efforts. In addition to more targeting our most prolific drug dealers through traditional drug interdiction efforts, we have raised the stakes for drug dealers whose product kills their customers by prosecuting them under the Drug-Induced-Death, Strict Liability homicide statute whenever the evidence supports it. In March 2018, a dealer was sentenced to twelve years in New Jersey state prison after he was convicted at trial for supplying heroin to a person who subsequently died from an overdose. Our local agency partners and the BCPO now treat all fatal overdoses as crime scenes and begin investigating immediately to determine who sold the victim their drugs. This disciplined approach has led us to charge more than 14 individuals under the DID statute, and also has resulted in stronger drug distribution cases when the evidence instead supports that crime.

Of course, we recognize that we cannot arrest our way out of this substance use epidemic, and the rise in fatalities has focused our attention on developing opportunities to save as many lives as possible. Since 2015, all law enforcement patrol cars in Burlington County have been supplied with the life-saving drug naloxone, which saves hundreds of lives each year. We also were proud to launch the Straight . . . to Treatment program in 2018, first in Evesham, then in Pemberton, and most recently, in Burlington City. Through Straight . . . to Treatment, any individual who is looking for help with their addiction can walk into the police station at designated days and times, and be screened and referred directly into treatment. "Clients" can turn in drugs or paraphernalia without consequence, and the police will work with the individual to clear any outstanding municipal warrants that might prevent them from getting help right away. In a year and a half, we have helped over 220 people through this program.

Another initiative we launched in 2018 was Operation Safe Overnight. Recognizing that Burlington County has a large number of hotels and motels, and that a large number of overdoses were occurring at motels, the BCPO invited property managers, including housekeeping staff, to a special briefing about the drug use landscape in the County. We

also trained attendees in how to use naloxone and provided free naloxone kit for them to take back to their properties and have available in case it was needed. The goal of Operation Safe Overnight is to increase awareness of the lifesaving potential of naloxone, and also to encourage its widespread availability in public places where overdoses tend to occur.

In 2018, the BCPO advanced our community outreach efforts in recognition of the importance of working closely and supporting the residents of Burlington County that we serve. We were proud to participate in every National Night Out event hosted by our local law enforcement agencies across the County, and to help prepare and serve a Thanksgiving meal at a church in Mount Holly and a Martin Luther King Day service project in Burlington City. We also hosted community forums on the standards for officer use-of-force and de-escalation techniques, the Attorney General's Immigration Directive, and personal stories of recovery from addiction. Additionally, through our Speaker's Bureau, BCPO detectives routinely speak to students in schools throughout the County on such topics as Internet safety, the dangers of drug use and some of our crime scene techniques.

Our engagement with the community is a top priority for our Office. We invite everyone to regularly check in with our Facebook page -- <https://www.facebook.com/burlpros> – and our Twitter feed -- <https://twitter.com/BurlcoPros>. And in the interests of further enhancing our transparency and communication with the public we serve, we are very pleased to introduce our re-designed web site, <https://burlpros.org>. We hope you will visit these online venues often for helpful information about our efforts to help keep Burlington County safe.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'S. B. G.', is centered on the page. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

THE COUNTY

Burlington County, New Jersey was officially incorporated in 1694 and is the largest county, geographically, in the state, covering 827 square miles. Its area covers 529,351 acres, of which 524,160 are land and 5,191 are water. It extends from the Delaware River to the Great Bay in the Atlantic Ocean. It is bounded on the north by Mercer County, on the northeast by Monmouth County, on the east by Ocean County, on the southeast by Atlantic County, and on the southwest by Camden County. There are forty municipal subdivisions, consisting of three cities, thirty-one townships and six boroughs. The county seat, where the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office is located, is in historic Mount Holly. The 2016 U.S. Census estimated population for Burlington County is 449,284.

THE PROSECUTOR

In New Jersey, the Prosecutor is the chief law enforcement officer in the county. The Prosecutor is responsible for the detection, apprehension, arrest, and conviction of violators of the criminal law. In several landmark cases, the Supreme Court of New Jersey has held that the Prosecutor is charged with the awesome responsibility of representing the state in criminal matters and may compel other law enforcement agencies to help him carry out his duties. The Prosecutor must work closely with several groups within the criminal justice system, including, but not limited to, the Office of the Attorney General, the Judiciary, the Sheriff, the jail administrator, Public Defender, police chiefs, the county governing body, State Parole Board, Trial Court Administrator, municipal court judges and prosecutors, and probation, social and educational agencies throughout the county.

THE OFFICE

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office (BCPO) is funded by the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders and during 2018 employed 120 people. The staff includes 34 attorneys, 43 investigators, 12 prosecutor's agents, 18 secretarial representatives, seven victim-witness advocates, one coordinator of nurse examiners (SART/SANE), one confidential aid, one county victim witness coordinator and three legal assistants. The BCPO also utilizes volunteer legal interns.

ATTORNEYS

Assistant prosecutors are responsible for rendering legal opinions, presenting cases to the Grand Jury, and handling all indictable cases. Attorneys must possess a New Jersey license to practice law, which requires graduation from an ABA accredited law school and successful completion of the New Jersey Bar exam and the bar's Continuing Legal Education requirements.

INVESTIGATORS

The detectives are the investigative branch of the BCPO. They initiate investigations as well as assist other police agencies with investigating a wide range of illegal conduct. These investigations include, but are not limited to, homicides and suspicious deaths, sexual assaults, child abuse, narcotics offenses, financial crimes, insurance fraud, arson, environmental crime, fatal motor vehicle accidents, and official misconduct. They possess full law enforcement authority and are responsible for conducting investigations and making arrests. They also provide valuable technical expertise and testimony when needed at trial. They are required to graduate from an approved police academy, maintain police certification, and maintain qualification to carry firearms.

PROSECUTOR'S AGENTS

Prosecutor's Agents perform multifaceted tasks and work with staff members, respond to the needs of victims and interact with numerous social service and law enforcement agencies. Agents are assigned to the Administrative, Case Screening, Civil Remedies, Family, Narcotics Task Force, Public Information, and Technical Services units, as well as the Child Advocacy Center. Prosecutor's Agents are required to have bachelor's or advanced degrees commensurate with their responsibilities. Appropriate experience may be substituted for the degree.

COUNTY VICTIM WITNESS COORDINATOR

The County Victim Witness Coordinator is responsible for the supervision and training of the victim advocates. The coordinator ensures that the rights of crime victims and witnesses are protected and provides training to assistant prosecutors, law enforcement personnel and other community agencies promoting awareness of victim's rights.

VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCATES

Advocates in the Victim Witness Unit help victims and witnesses navigate the criminal justice system, and provide support from the very beginning to the very end of the process, and beyond. The advocates are responsible to ensure that the rights afforded to crime victims by the New Jersey Crime Victims Bill of Rights are upheld; and that they are treated with dignity and respect throughout the entire process. They work as liaisons between the victim or witness, assistant prosecutors, county detectives, local law enforcement, social services agencies and the courts.

Advocates assigned to the Child Advocacy Center monitor victim interviews, meet with families, make necessary therapy and medical referrals, and provide support and crisis intervention. Advocates communicate with local law enforcement personnel, assistant prosecutors, governmental organizations, and mental and medical health care providers to make sure all disciplines work together to protect the victim.

CLERICAL STAFF

Clerical personnel play an integral role in the operation of the Office. They are responsible for all of the correspondence, filing and record keeping. They also provide critical support for assembling and producing discovery, producing and tracking grand jury subpoenas, and for meeting the increased demands of criminal justice reform.

INTERNS

The BCPO utilizes interns to perform supervised legal assignments. Legal interns are law students who are working to complete their law school education but have not yet been admitted to the Bar. Legal interns prepare briefs and memoranda and make limited court appearances pursuant to court rules, under the supervision of assistant prosecutors.

LEGAL ASSISTANTS

Legal assistants complete case preparation work, review all police department complaints, compile and assess law enforcement reports, medical documentation, witness statements, victim statements and perform supplemental case review to make sure files are organized for screening by the designated assistant prosecutor. Legal assistants also send subpoenas for trial, schedule witnesses for testimony, request evidence be delivered and perform required ancillary tasks.

SEXUAL ASSAULT RESPONSE TEAM/SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS COODINATOR

The Sexual Assault Response Team/Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SART/SANE) Coordinator is responsible for the recruitment, training and supervision of the nurse examiners and is the liaison to the five participating exam sites, maintains chain-of-custody for all evidence, writes policies and procedures, maintains case files, communicates with law enforcement agencies and oversees the response of the SART.

APPELLATE UNIT

The Appellate Unit has three assistant prosecutors and one clerical staff member. The assistant prosecutors in the unit are responsible for briefing and orally arguing appeals at various levels of New Jersey's courts and in the federal courts.

The unit's attorneys argue appeals from all of Burlington County's municipal courts, which are heard as trials de novo in the Superior Court, Law Division. They also argue appeals from the Law Division to the Superior Court, Appellate Division and the Supreme Court of New Jersey. The unit routinely handles all levels of appeal from non-indictable matters. Appeals from indictable convictions are referred to the unit by way of the Appellate Bureau of the Office of the Attorney General, Division of Criminal Justice. The unit also proactively initiates its own appeals, in those cases where the State is permitted to appeal - most often on leave to appeal from adverse interlocutory rulings.

The Appellate Unit attorneys are also responsible for briefing and arguing civil petitions for writ of habeas corpus in the federal courts - the District Court for New Jersey, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and the United States Supreme Court. These matters are all referred to the unit through the Division of Criminal Justice, Appellate Bureau.

The unit's attorneys are responsible for briefing and arguing motions for post-conviction relief in the Superior Court, Law Division, and a majority of the appeals therefrom.

One of the unit's attorneys is responsible for coordinating the Pretrial Intervention Program. The assistant prosecutor, in conjunction with the PTI director from the probation department, makes determinations whether to reject or admit individual defendants to the program. The Appellate Unit handles appeals of these determinations - either when a defendant who has been rejected appeals, or when the State appeals the Superior Court judge's decision to order someone into the program over the State's objection.

One of the unit's attorneys is responsible for handling expungements. Pursuant to statute, in limited instances, defendants may be entitled to have their criminal record expunged after an application to a Superior Court judge. This unit reviews such applications and objects to expungement when necessary. Briefs and oral arguments are required when objections to the expungement application are opposed by the Prosecutor.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE v. AMANDA GUSRANG

On December 6, 2013, Pemberton Township police officers on routine patrol came upon the scene of a motor vehicle collision on a rural road. One vehicle had rolled onto the driver's side in a muddy field next to the roadway. The victim was still and face down in the mud. Officers broke the rear passenger window, entered the vehicle, and with the aid of a bystander, were able to lift the victim's head out of the mud. While officers were trying to

extricate the victim, they learned that a second vehicle involved in the collision was approximately 100 yards down the road.

Police went to the location of the second vehicle and found the defendant, Amanda Gusrang, standing outside her vehicle. The defendant was not seriously injured but had some blood on her shirt. She told officers she was on her way home from her job as a bartender. Police noticed the odor of alcoholic beverage in his patrol vehicle after the defendant was seated in the rear seat.

Due to the muddy conditions, efforts to remove the victim from the mud required several rescue and first responder teams, including an ambulance, paramedics, and two fire departments. Seven of the eight on-duty police officers from Pemberton Township responded to the scene. Two off-duty officers and an officer from a neighboring town also came to the scene, which one officer described as chaotic. The victim died as a result of injuries sustained in the collision.

The defendant was transported to a hospital so a sample of her blood could be drawn. She was asked to provide her consent for the drawing of the sample. An officer read the defendant the consent form as she was being treated for an arm injury. The defendant replied, "Go ahead," and extended her right arm. The nurse who was treating the defendant and taking a sample of her blood for the hospital took a sample for the police; however, when the officer asked her to sign the consent form, she refused to do so. Police obtained a taped statement from the nurse who took her blood, but the tape was lost. The defendant's blood-alcohol content was .22 percent approximately one hour after the collision.

The defendant moved to suppress the results of her blood draw, arguing that her consent was not voluntary, that no exigent circumstances justified the warrantless blood draw. The trial court denied the defendant's motion, concluding that exigent circumstances justified the drawing of the defendant's blood without a warrant. The trial court noted that the investigation required the attention of many officers, multiple agencies attempted to get the victim out of the mud, and the investigation lasted for over four hours. The defendant pled guilty to second degree vehicular homicide, and appealed from the denial of her motion to suppress.

On appeal, the Appellate Division affirmed the trial court's denial of the defendant's motion. The Appellate Division noted that a legitimate exigency justified the warrantless drawing of a sample of the defendant's blood, citing the complexity of the situation and limited police resources. The Appellate Division also noted that defendant needed medical treatment and that she contributed to the difficulties the officer faced in obtaining the blood draw. Specifically, the Appellate Division pointed out that the defendant consented to the blood draw, then after being treated, withdrew her consent. The panel thus concluded that under the totality of the circumstances, the dissipation of alcohol in the defendant's blood created an objective exigency that justified the warrantless search.

STATE V. BRANDON WASHINGTON

In February 2017, Brandon Washington shot two men in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Hall in Willingboro Township. The defendant fled the scene, and a pair of eyeglasses police were able to connect to him was found at the hall in the area where the defendant struggled with one of the victims. The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office obtained DNA samples from the defendant and the victims, and sent the samples and eyeglasses to the New Jersey State Police Central Regional Laboratory in March 2017. The defendant was arrested, detained pending trial, and indicted for two counts of first degree Attempted Murder.

The defendant's trial was scheduled to begin on November 28, 2017, and his release date was December 2, 2017. On November 16, 2017, the Prosecutor's Office received an email from the NJSP Central Regional Laboratory that contained a one-page DNA report. The report indicated that the defendant was the source of the major DNA profile obtained from the eyeglasses. The Prosecutor's Office provided the DNA report to defense counsel the same day. On November 17, 2017, the State moved for a complex case designation, asked for a 30-day adjournment of trial, and asked that 60 days from November 17, 2017, through January 17, 2018, be deemed excludable time pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:162-22(b)(1)(g). The defendant moved to exclude the DNA results. The trial court denied the State's motions for a complex case designation and for 60 days of excludable time. The court granted the State 11 days of excludable time, extending the defendant's release date to December 13, 2018. Also, on November 29, 2017, the trial court granted the defendant's motion to exclude the DNA results and denied the State's request for an adjournment of trial.

The State moved for reconsideration, providing the trial court with additional material it received from the NJSP Central Regional Laboratory regarding the time it took to analyze and issue a report on the relevant DNA samples. Specifically, the State provided the certification of the analyzing forensic scientist, who certified that although she had completed her lab report on July 25, 2017, technical peer review and approval by the DNA Technical Leader took additional time. She certified that final technical review of the lab report was completed on November 3, 2017, final administrative review of the report was completed on November 8, 2017, and that due to clerical shortages, the report was not provided to the Prosecutor's Office until November 16, 2017.

The trial court denied the State's motion for reconsideration and the State moved for permission to file an emergent motion. The Appellate Division stayed trial pending resolution of the State's motion, and granted the State's motion for leave to appeal. The trial court ordered the period between December 14, 2017 and February 28, 2018 as excludable time. The defendant appealed the excludable time orders, and the Appellate Division denied his motion for a stay.

On appeal, the Appellate Division reversed the trial court's order excluding the DNA evidence, holding that the DNA evidence was not within the possession or control of the Prosecutor's Office until November 16, 2017. Thus, the Appellate Division concluded, the Prosecutor's Office properly complied with its continuing duty to provide discovery pursuant to R. 3:13-3(f). The Appellate Division also held that the trial court erred in denying the

State's motion for a continuance of trial to permit the parties to obtain experts on the DNA issue. Finally, the Appellate Division held that the time while the State's emergent application, motion for leave to appeal, and appeal, once leave was granted, is excludable time, concluding that an interlocutory appeal constitutes a motion pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:162-22(b)(1)(c).

COLLISION ANALYSIS AND RECONSTRUCTION (CAR) UNIT

The Collision Analysis and Reconstruction (CAR) Unit is responsible for the investigation of all fatal motor vehicle/vessel crashes that occur within Burlington County, as well as all serious motor vehicle crashes where the at-fault driver is suspected of engaging in criminally reckless conduct. The CAR Unit also investigates all police-involved motor vehicle crashes, including police pursuits resulting in injury.

The CAR Unit is presently operating in conjunction with the Major Crimes Unit (MCU). CAR Unit operations are carried out via the MCU chain of command. The CAR Unit is supervised by an assistant prosecutor who also supervises the Insurance Fraud Unit. MCU personnel are responsible for assisting the supervising assistant prosecutor with the investigation of CAR Unit cases and preparing same for trial. A Victim Witness Advocate is responsible for victim outreach which includes processing discovery requests pursuant to subpoenas and document requests pursuant to the Open Public Records Act (OPRA).

In 2018, the CAR Unit investigated 118 fatal and serious motor vehicle crashes during the calendar year. Criminal charges, including Vehicular Homicide, Assault by Auto, Causing Death or Serious Injury While Suspended and Leaving the Scene of a Fatal/Serious Motor Vehicle Crash were filed in 19 cases.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE v. SHADE COOPER

A former U.S. Air Force military police officer was sentenced on September 7, 2018 in Superior Court to ten years in New Jersey state prison with an 85% period of parole ineligibility for causing an automobile accident in Bordentown Township in late 2015 that killed two people, including her estranged husband. Shade Cooper, 28, of East Granby, Connecticut, was convicted in June 2018 by a jury on two counts of Reckless Manslaughter (Second Degree).

On December 2, 2015, the day of the fatal accident, Nicholas Cooper was visiting his children at Shade Cooper's apartment on Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst. The State argued during the trial that Shade Cooper became angry when another woman – Jocelyn Redding – came to pick him up when the visit was over.

Shade Cooper followed them in her vehicle for approximately 10 miles, at one point striking the Hyundai Elantra being driven by Redding. As the pursuit continued at high

speed, Redding was unable to negotiate a curve in the roadway near the intersection of Route 545 and Clifton Mills Road in Bordentown Township. Her vehicle entered the oncoming lane and was struck by a pickup truck. The impact sent Redding's vehicle off the roadway into a wooded area, killing Nicholas Cooper, 26, and Redding, 23, of Hamilton Township, Mercer County. The driver of the pickup truck was treated and released at an area hospital.

STATE v. JACOB GARRETT

Jacob T. Garrett, 25, pled guilty in July 2018 to Vehicular Homicide (First Degree) and Leaving the Scene of a Fatal Accident (Second Degree), and was sentenced on October 18, 2018 to fifteen years in state prison with an 85% period of parole ineligibility.

The investigation revealed that Garrett was traveling at a high rate of speed along Riverbank Road in Burlington City on January 14, 2018 when his vehicle struck a parked minivan before crashing through a fence and into the river near Wood Street. The front end of the car broke through the ice and became submerged.

Witnesses to the crash who rushed over to the scene indicated Garrett was already out of the vehicle by the time they arrived. "Help my girlfriend," are the words witnesses reported Garrett as saying to them before he fled on foot.

Stephanie White, 23, of Burlington City, was found inside the sunken vehicle with her seat belt still fastened. She was extricated by emergency workers and transported to Lourdes Medical Center of Burlington County in Willingboro, where she was pronounced dead.

City of Burlington Police Officer Charles Haney and his German shepherd K-9 partner Kobi tracked Garrett from the river to the Burlington Towne Center North light rail platform on West Broad Street. Police then had the train stopped at the Beverly/Edgewater Park station, where Garrett was taken into custody.

Garrett admitted that he had been drinking Fireball whiskey prior to the accident. His blood alcohol level was .17 four hours after the crash.

STATE V. ISIAH BUCHANAN

Isaiah Buchanan, 19, pled guilty in October 2018 to Aggravated Manslaughter (First Degree) and was sentenced on December 7, 2018 to fourteen years in New Jersey State Prison with an 85% period of parole ineligibility.

The investigation revealed that on November 15, 2017, Buchanan was driving a stolen BMW sedan along Route 130 south in Cinnaminson when the collision occurred near the intersection with Riverton Road. Cassidy Bush, a sophomore at Palmyra High School who was Buchanan's passenger, was pronounced dead at the scene.

The investigation further revealed that the vehicle had previously been reported as stolen out of Cinnaminson. Cinnaminson police had attempted to execute a traffic stop on the vehicle prior to the collision, but Buchanan accelerated instead of pulling over.

Toxicology tests conducted on blood drawn from Buchanan indicated he had been using cocaine, marijuana and Xanax prior to the collision. Buchanan was a juvenile at the time, and the Prosecutor's Office successfully argued that he be waived up from juvenile court and tried as an adult.

CIVIL REMEDIES UNIT

The Civil Remedies Unit prosecutes civil forfeiture actions where the State has seized money, motor vehicles, real estate and personal property received as proceeds of, or utilized in connection with or in furtherance of, unlawful activity. The Unit is staffed by one full-time assistant prosecutor, one part-time assistant prosecutor, a prosecutor's agent and a secretary. The Unit files complaints and motions, negotiates settlements and is responsible for trials, among other civil litigation procedures. The Unit also handles miscellaneous civil litigation involving the Prosecutor's Office, advises and educates local police departments regarding forfeitures and is responsible for responding to Open Public Records Act requests received by the Office.

Forfeiture matters can arise from any indictable offense. Although forfeiture is not limited to narcotics cases, narcotics-related forfeitures are the most common. Forfeiture cases are generated by various law enforcement agencies including our Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF) and Office units such as Sexual Assault/Child Abuse, Financial Crimes and Major Crimes, and from municipal, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies. By participation with federal agencies, this Office has received shares of federally forfeited funds.

In 2018, state and federal civil forfeiture generated \$395,199.00 in cash and property for law enforcement use. Of civil judgments and auction totals, \$116,413.24 was distributed to participating state and local law enforcement agencies and some \$238,678.00 was deposited in the Burlington County Prosecutor's Law Enforcement Trust Account.

The Civil Remedies Unit also coordinates the use, sale and disposition of currency, vehicles and real and personal property obtained through forfeiture. After entry of judgment in a forfeiture case, the proceeds are distributed to participating state and local law enforcement agencies. Some expenses, such as the Ten Percent Fund, are deducted before contributive shares are calculated. The Ten Percent Fund was established to encourage local police departments to send officers to train with our GGNTF. As a result of their participation, local departments receive a *pro rata* share of ten percent of forfeited funds generated during a 12-month period. In 2018, \$39,165.00 in Ten Percent Funds was distributed to participating departments.

Property that is forfeited includes cash, cars and miscellaneous items such as flat screen televisions. Vehicles and other useful miscellaneous personal property are sometimes turned over to local police departments for law enforcement use. After forfeiture or the term of usefulness, items and vehicles are sold at public auction. Property forfeited in

2018 included cash, cars and miscellaneous property. Five vehicles were turned over to local police departments for law enforcement use.

The Civil Remedies Unit relies on the Screening, Juvenile and Evidence Management Units of the Office and networks with local police and New Jersey State Police regarding potential forfeiture cases. Potential cases are reviewed by the assistant prosecutor with occasional subsequent review by the Prosecutor. In addition to other duties, the Unit secretary creates new files, tracks service and discovery, updates the forfeiture computer program and records and files orders, *lis pendens* and judgments, among other documents. In 2018, 206 cases were reviewed for forfeiture and some 268 pending matters were resolved or partially resolved.

The Evidence Management Unit provides service to the Civil Remedies Unit by securing, documenting and tabulating seized funds and miscellaneous property until a final court order is entered and the funds and/or property are available for disbursement. The County Treasurer's Office maintains the various forfeiture accounts. The Prosecutor's office manager monitors the accounts and per the Attorney General's forfeiture regulations files quarterly reports and reconciles local departments' forfeiture reporting.

Funds generated through forfeiture are strictly limited to law enforcement use, and expenditures of local police departments are monitored by the Prosecutor's Office. Forfeiture is used to finance expenditures to enhance law enforcement capabilities such as training for personnel, escalating the GGNTF campaign and increasing public education efforts to combat criminal activity and drug abuse.

2018 CONTRIBUTIVE SHARES DISTRIBUTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

BORDENTOWN TWP	\$ 7,289.59
BURLINGTON CITY	1,040.47
BURLINGTON TOWNSHIP	4,579.68
CINNAMINSON TOWNSHIP	20,011.01
DELANCO TOWNSHIP	1,671.34
DELTRAN TOWNSHIP	1,065.56
EASTAMPTON TOWNSHIP	4,546.84
EDGEWATER PARK TWP	6,926.16
EVESHAM TOWNSHIP	21,436.64
FLORENCE TOWNSHIP	958.59
GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP	1,065.56
MAPLE SHADE TOWNSHIP	761.71
MEDFORD TOWNSHIP	3,172.48
MOORESTOWN TOWNSHIP	4,404.50
MOUNT HOLLY TOWNSHIP	1,098.00
MOUNT LAUREL TWP	2,176.08
NEW HANOVER TOWNSHIP	1,097.40
NJ TREAS OFC CRIM INVEST	5,833.15
NORTH HANOVER TWP	1,604.35
PALMYRA BOROUGH	4,051.15
PEMBERTON BOROUGH	678.00
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	5,747.21
RIVERSIDE TOWNSHIP	539.34

RIVERTON BOROUGH	922.67
WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP	1,065.56
WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP	1,670.90
WILLINGBORO TOWNSHIP	5,138.71
WINSLOW TOWNSHIP	1,065.56
BURLINGTON CO SHERIFF	2,663.91
CAMDEN CO PROSECUTOR	2,131.12
GRAND TOTAL	\$116,413.24

CRIME SCENE UNIT

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Crime Scene Unit (CSU) falls under the command of a detective lieutenant. CSU consists of two detectives and one prosecutor's agent, who are supervised by a detective sergeant and perform all aspects of forensic investigations. The duties of the Crime Scene Unit include crime scene processing, photography, video recording of major crime incidents, identification and evaluation of items of physical evidence, conducting chemical and other scientific analysis, preparation of crime scene diagrams, measurements of crime scenes and the location of evidence in accordance with accepted procedures, development of latent fingerprints, examination and analysis of fingerprints, evaluation and comparison of latent fingerprints to known prints, and documentation of post-mortem examinations.

The members of the CSU also search crime scenes for biological evidence such as blood and other bodily fluids utilizing specialized equipment, including forensic light sources and chemical reagents. Crime Scene Unit investigators are trained in crime scene analysis and reconstruction, including bloodstain pattern analysis. Members of the CSU also prepare courtroom exhibits for trial use and provide forensic expert witness testimony in the areas of fingerprint identifications, bloodstain pattern analysis, shooting reconstruction, and crime scene reconstruction as required.

In addition to working on major crimes handled by the BCPO, these detectives also provide assistance to the other units of the Prosecutor's Office, such as the Major Crimes Unit, Collision and Accident Reconstruction Unit, Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force, Trial Team, Special Investigations Unit, Financial Crimes Unit, and Family Unit. Also, CSU provides services and assistance to municipal police departments in the furtherance of solving crimes not directly handled by the BCPO.

OPERATIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN 2018

In 2018, CSU detectives conducted approximately 11 death investigations involving 5 homicides. The remaining death investigations included fatal motor vehicle collisions, a fatal fire/arson, a drowning, suspicious death investigations, and child/infant fatalities. CSU also responded to 6 serious aggravated assault investigations.

Additionally, CSU detectives conducted approximately 43 crime scene related investigations involving attempted murders, fatal fires, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults, bank robberies, robberies, drug offenses, burglaries, weapons offenses, police-involved shootings and special investigations. Twelve (12) of these cases involved latent fingerprint examinations and comparisons. In addition to the above, CSU detectives testified in numerous homicide and other trials during 2018.

EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Evidence Management Unit (EMU) falls under the command of a detective lieutenant. EMU is comprised of two prosecutor's agents and one clerical employee under the supervision of a detective sergeant. The EMU is responsible for receiving all evidence which is logged, categorized, inventoried and maintained in a computerized accounting system. This function includes evidence from not only the BCPO but also from all of the municipal law enforcement agencies in Burlington County and the New Jersey State Police.

The Evidence Management Unit handles the intake and subsequent forfeiture or release of hundreds of firearms, as well as other weapons seized throughout Burlington County. There is a regular program for the review and purging of evidence once appeal and statute of limitations requirements are met. Municipal police departments are provided the opportunity to dispose of evidence on an annual basis through an EMU disposal program. The Evidence Management Unit also handles the disposal of firearms for the municipal departments in conformance with the BCPO policy.

OPERATIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN 2018

In 2018, the Evidence Management Unit continued to digitize and electronically archive old case files and continued to move toward operating in a virtually paperless environment. In addition, the Evidence Management Unit moved to a new software application (Infoshare) in 2018. In total, the Evidence Management Unit received or released evidence on approximately 3,500 occasions. There were approximately 2,552 Log Entries into the Evidence Management System in 2018. The unit held one destruction operation resulting in the destruction of 2.5 tons of evidence, which included over 2,000 general items and 350 firearms.

FAMILY UNIT

The Family Unit consists of five full-time assistant prosecutors, two assigned to juvenile, two to the domestic violence section of the unit, and one supervisor. In addition to the attorneys assigned to the unit, there are two clerical workers, one legal assistant, one victim witness advocate assigned to the Domestic Violence contempt cases in Family Court, and one detective assigned to the unit. The Juvenile Section of the Family Unit is charged with the prosecution of all juvenile delinquency cases scheduled on the formal court calendar in Family Court. In addition, assistant prosecutors assigned to the unit appear on behalf of the State at all detention hearings, and at hearings requesting an order to release juvenile police/probation records.

The Unit Supervisor provides recommendations to the Prosecutor concerning applications to prosecute a juvenile as an adult in criminal court. While the unit's functions are essentially and predominantly legal in nature, assistant prosecutors in the unit must be knowledgeable in all areas of juvenile therapy, counseling, and education. Additionally, they work with probation officers, social workers, therapists, the Division of Child Protection and Permanency, and others concerned with the welfare and care of juveniles in order to help keep juveniles out of the criminal justice system.

The Domestic Violence Section of the Family Unit screens all domestic violence cases that come to the Office. The section prosecutes incidents of Domestic Violence and takes indictable matters to the Grand Jury and trial when necessary. Additionally, the unit co-chairs the County Domestic Violence Working Group. The unit also screens and prosecutes interference child custody cases and willful non-support matters. In addition to indictable level cases, two assistant prosecutors in the unit are responsible for the prosecution of disorderly persons contempt cases in the Family Court. Additionally, all applications seeking the return of weapons seized as a result of domestic violence must be reviewed by the legal staff to ensure that the return is appropriate. Where forfeiture of weapons is sought, an assistant prosecutor will argue such applications on behalf of the State in the Family Court. Finally, assistant prosecutors in the domestic violence section prepare training materials for presentation to local law enforcement and also the domestic violence response teams where necessary.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE OF NEW JERSEY IN THE INTEREST OF M.W.

On May 2, 2017 at approximately 11:45 pm, police responded for a report of male with a gun in Monroe Park. Officers spoke with a male, T.R., and female, H.J., on scene, who indicated that a black male came up to them pointing a handgun, forced T.R. to the ground, and forced H.J. to walk with him towards the creek. H.J. revealed that the male threatened to shoot her several times, hit her in the head with the gun when she tried to get away, and ultimately forced her to take her shirt off, ripped her bra, and forced her to perform oral sex. M.W. was subsequently identified as a potential suspect following a

similar incident in the park. The victim, H.J., identified M.W. as the suspect. Additionally, in October 2017, a CODIS hit came back from the SANE examination performed on H.J., with a match to M.W. The DNA match was confirmed after a search warrant was executed for a sample of M.W.'s DNA. M.W., who was fourteen years old at the time of the offense, was ultimately charged with first-degree aggravated sexual assault, second-degree unlawful possession of a firearm, and third-degree assault with a deadly weapon.

A trial commenced in Family Part on February 22, 2018 and February 23, 2018. M.W. was found guilty of all charges and sentenced to two years in the Jamesburg Training Facility for Boys.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY IN THE INTEREST OF S.F.

On Thursday, July 26, 2018, at approximately 0236 hours, officers from the Edgewater Park Township Police Department were dispatched to the 7-11 store, located at 1133 Cooper Street, for an armed robbery that had just occurred. Detective Sergeant John Harris spoke with the store clerk, Nirmal Singal, who advised that three male subjects entered the store, brandished handguns, and demanded money. Specifically, he stated that one of the subjects stood by the door while the other two stood at the front counter and demanded money from the register. Mr. Singal confirmed he opened the cash register and gave them all the cash inside. Once he gave them the money from the register, the three subjects ran out of the store.

On Saturday, July 28, 2018, Detective Michael Casella from the Burlington Township Police Department (BTPD) responded to the 7-11 store located at 1611 Columbus Road, to assist patrol units with an armed robbery investigation. Upon his arrival, he was advised that three unknown males entered the store. Two of the males brandished handguns and proceeded behind the counter where they removed the entire cash drawer and several packs of Newport Cigarettes. After leaving the store, the three subjects then fled the scene on foot on Columbus Road in the direction of Route 130.

On Sunday, July 29, 2018, at 12:59 a.m., Delran Township Police Department units were dispatched to the 7-11 at 18 Haines Mill Road for an attempted armed robbery. Dispatch described the suspects as two black males wearing black ski masks and displaying a handgun. Dispatch further advised that the suspects left the location in a vehicle prior to police arrival. Upon arriving on scene, Patrol Officer Jill Boyle spoke with three witnesses, Serena S. Grace, Mark M. Szymanski, and Mykayla K. Haley, who advised that they were together in an Uber that pulled into the 7-11 after picking them up from Whistler's Inn. Mr. Szymanski stated he was the front seat passenger and Ms. Grace and Ms. Haley were seated in the rear of the vehicle. Although there were no vehicles in the parking lot, they observed two male subjects inside the store, which they found strange.

According to Ptl. Boyle, all three witnesses gave the same account of what happened. First, they described Suspect #1 as a younger black male, approximately 6' tall and wearing dark pants and a black ski mask. Suspect #2 was described as a younger black male, approximately 5'6" to 5'8" tall and wearing a white T-shirt, dark pants, and a black

ski mask. The witnesses advised that the shorter male was standing in front of the register and the taller male was next to the lottery machine. When the shorter male observed their Uber pull into the lot, he began motioning to the other suspect with his hands to leave. The shorter male then ran out of the store in the direction of Sal's Barber Shop. The taller male ran out of the store and the witnesses observed a silver firearm in his hand. Mr. Szymanski stated he was unsure whether it was a revolver or a handgun. They witnessed the suspects run to an unknown black four-door vehicle parked in the rear of Sal's Barber Shop. Mr. Szymanski stated the vehicle was possibly a 2005 or newer model and may be a Chevrolet. Prior to getting in the vehicle and fleeing, the witnesses observed the taller suspect with the gun raise his arm in the air and fire a round straight up into the air. The witnesses stated that they heard the gunshot and observed a flash in the air after the discharge. They did not see where the vehicle went because they instructed their Uber driver to pull out of the parking lot and leave to call the police.

After the Delran Township robbery, Det. Casella decided to process another one of the water bottles and the traffic cone from the Burlington Township robbery for any additional latent prints. He did so by fuming the items and was able to develop four additional potential prints. All prints were secured into an AFIS Request for Latent Fingerprint Examination envelope and transported to the West Trenton AFIS Unit for identification.

On July 31, 2018, Detective Casella received notification from the AFIS Unit who identified one of the prints as belonging to B.R. A check of B.R.'s criminal history revealed his picture. Detective Casella immediately identified B.R. as Suspect # 3 who was casing the 7-11 just prior to the Edgewater Park robbery and noted that he was wearing the same glasses in his CCH picture. Detective Casella notified Detective Harry Cassey from Delran Township and Detective Sergeant Harris of his recent findings. Based on this new information, Detective Sergeant Harris investigated further and learned B.R. was reported missing by his mother on Thursday, July 26, 2018, and was last seen with S.F. He also learned B.R. was no longer entered in NCIC as a missing person but was now at home. A criminal history check for S.F. revealed his date of birth and his address of Spruce Street in Camden, NJ.

The subsequent investigation resulted in the following charges:

For the incident occurring on July 26, 2018, S.F. was charged on a juvenile complaint with the following offenses: Count One charged first-degree Robbery, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:15-1a(2); Count Two charged fourth-degree Aggravated Assault with a Firearm, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:12-1b(4); Count Three charged second-degree Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Handgun), in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:39-5b(1); and Count Four charged fourth-degree Theft of Moveable Property by Unlawful Taking, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:20-3a.

For the incident occurring on July 28, 2018, S.F. was charged on a juvenile complaint with the following offenses: Count One charged first-degree Robbery, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:15-1a(2); Count Two charged second-degree Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Handgun), in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:39-5b(1); Count Three charged second-

degree Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:39-4a(1); Count Four charged fourth-degree Aggravated Assault with a Firearm, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:12-1b(4); Count Five charged fourth-degree Theft of Moveable Property by Unlawful Taking, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:20-3a; and Count Six charged second-degree Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2a(1) and N.J.S.A. 2C:15-1a(2).

For the incident occurring on July 29, 2018, S.F. was charged on a juvenile complaint with the following offenses: Count One charged first-degree Robbery, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:15-1a(2); Count Two charged second-degree Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:39-4a(1); Count Three charged second-degree Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Handgun), in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:39-5b(1); Count Four charged fourth-degree Aggravated Assault with a Firearm, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:12-1b(4); and Count Five charged second-degree Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2a(1) and N.J.S.A. 2C:15-1a(2).

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:4A-26.1(c)(2)(a), Robbery, which constitutes a crime of the first degree, is eligible for waiver. Accordingly, the three separate charges of first degree Robbery were eligible offenses. The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office filed a motion for juvenile waiver, seeking to prosecute S.F. as an adult for all three incidents. Prior to the waiver hearing, an agreement was reached where S.F. consented to a voluntary waiver to the Superior Court- Criminal Part. In the Superior Court- Criminal Part, S.F. pled guilty to three counts of first-degree Robbery and three counts of second-degree Unlawful Possession of a Weapon in exchange for ten years in New Jersey State Prison with an 85% period of parole ineligibility pursuant to the No Early Release Act. In exchange for his voluntary waiver, S.F. shall be placed in a facility by the Juvenile Justice Commission until the age of 21 and may continue to serve his sentence in a juvenile facility past the age of 21 at the discretion of the Juvenile Justice Commission. Sentencing is currently scheduled for June 12, 2019.

FINANCIAL CRIMES UNIT

The Financial Crimes Unit of the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office was created in December 2010 and is responsible for the intake, review and screening of the majority of economic crime complaints and investigations, including, but not limited to, non-sex-based computer crimes, consumer fraud, counterfeit goods and trademark infringement cases, estate and trust fraud, health care claims fraud, Internet fraud, mortgage and loan modification fraud, money laundering, welfare fraud and other embezzlement and identity theft cases.

This unit, which is comprised of an assistant prosecutor, a detective, a prosecutor's agent, and an administrative assistant, serves as the principal point-of-contact for all of the local, state and federal agencies that are investigating these types of crimes, as well as directly with the victims and financial institutions impacted by same. If after initial intake of an inquiry or a complaint an investigation is deemed to be a "financial crime," then the individuals in the Financial Crimes Unit are responsible for issuing Grand Jury subpoenas,

conducting interviews, and analyzing and reviewing any financial records or documents associated with a particular investigation – whether it was worked exclusively or jointly with another agency. In most instances, Financial Crimes Unit cases involve a multitude of victims, significant amounts of money, or both, and often require coordination with multiple agencies.

In addition to receiving cases and investigations pre- and post-complaint for review, the Financial Crimes Unit reviews all of the electronic, telephonic and paper complaints referred to the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office via the Attorney General's Office, Divisions of Criminal Justice and Consumer Affairs, and the Burlington County Board of Social Services. The Financial Crimes Unit also fields all of the electronic referrals from the Internet Crime Complaint Center, which is an Internet site sponsored by the FBI and serves as an online clearing house for Internet fraud complaints. If a victim, suspect, or witness of such a complaint has any connection to Burlington County, it will be sent to the Financial Crimes Unit.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE v. BRIAN MURPHY

The defendant, who resides on Wharton Place in Hainesport, NJ, was employed as a financial planner with Murphy Financial Advisors in Moorestown, New Jersey. In that fiduciary capacity, the defendant misappropriated \$890,000 from one of his clients. The investigation revealed that from March 2011 until July 2016, Murphy used these funds to pay for personal and business expenses instead of investing the money provided to him by the client. More specifically, the stolen funds were used to cover, among other things, expenses at a local country club, a private school, established retail organizations, lending institutions, an automobile dealer and an attorney. The investigation also determined that Murphy underreported his taxable income in 2012, 2014 and 2015 and failed to file a New Jersey tax return in 2013. This case was investigated in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Treasury, Office of Criminal Investigations.

On September 27, 2017, the defendant pleaded guilty to an Accusation charging 2nd degree Misapplication of Entrusted Property and 3rd degree Failure to Pay NJ Income Taxes. On January 10, 2018, the defendant was sentenced to an aggregate term of incarceration of seven years in New Jersey state prison before the Honorable Christopher J. Garrenger, J.S.C. As part of defendant's sentence, he is required to make full restitution to the victim upon release from custody.

STATE v. WILLIAM DIAZ, ELAINE TAYLOR, et al.

The defendants, who reside in Elizabeth and East Orange respectively, were involved in an identity theft/loan fraud ring that spanned multiple counties (Burlington, Camden, Essex, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth and Union) in New Jersey and throughout Pennsylvania. The Burlington County cases originated out of Palmyra Borough and Burlington City, but the investigation subsequently revealed criminal conduct with a nexus

to Cinnaminson Township, Pennsauken Township, Sayreville Borough, West Long Branch Borough, Edison Township, Princeton Township, Linden City, Old Bridge Township, Piscataway Township, Elizabeth City and East Orange City. The losses to multiple financial institutions was approximately \$175,000 along with another \$350,000 in attempted thefts. This case was investigated in cooperation with the Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office.

On September 28, 2017, a Burlington County Grand Jury returned a thirty-seven count indictment charging a multitude of theft and fraud counts.

On January 5, 2018, defendant Taylor pleaded guilty to 2nd degree Conspiracy to Commit Theft by Deception. On February 2, 2018, defendant Taylor was sentenced to a five (5) year period of Special Drug Court Probation.

On January 12, 2018, defendant Diaz pleaded guilty to 2nd degree Theft by Deception but passed away on January 13, 2018.

STATE v. JOSEPH FREED III

The defendant, who resides on North Coles Avenue in Maple Shade, NJ, was the long-time chief of the Maple Shade Township First Aid Squad. In that capacity, the defendant misappropriated \$118,345.50 of the First Aid Squad's monies. The investigation revealed that from April of 2010 and February 2017, the defendant had been making unauthorized cash withdrawals from the Squad's account, over which he had exclusive control, and used the money to pay personal bills and to fund other personal expenses. This case was investigated in cooperation with the Maple Shade Township Police Department.

On March 29, 2018, the defendant pleaded guilty to a single-count indictment charging 2nd degree Theft by Deception.

On June 21, 2018, the defendant was sentenced to a three-year period of incarceration in New Jersey state prison before the Hon. Charles A. Delehey, J.S.C. The defendant paid full restitution to the Squad before sentencing.

STATE v. GUISEPPE CAIRA

The defendant, who resides on Bainbridge Drive in Mullica Hill, NJ, is a licensed home improvement contractor. In that capacity, the defendant utilized funds given to him by a Moorestown couple and a resident of Lumberton for their respective home improvement projects for his own purposes. The investigation revealed the defendant spent significant amounts of money (approximately \$250,000) on his then girlfriend, trips and luxury items unconnected to the business during the relevant time period. As a result of Caira's diversion of funds, the victims had to incur significant additional expenditures (alleging \$100,000+) to complete their construction projects.

On June 25, 2018, the defendant pleaded guilty to multiple indictments charging Theft by Deception and Theft by Failure to Make Required Disposition of Property Received. The defendant also consolidated several cases from Atlantic, Gloucester and Ocean Counties for disposition in Burlington County.

On July 23, 2018, the defendant was sentenced to a five-year period of Special Drug Court probation before the Honorable Christopher Garrenger, J.S.C. As part of his sentence, the defendant is required to make restitution to his victims.

STATE v. DONNA BUCIA

The defendant, who resides on Main Avenue in Cherry Hill, was the bookkeeper/Office Manager for the Riverton Country Club. In that capacity, Bucia misappropriated \$190,909.40 in cash and was able to conceal the thefts by depositing third-party checks (e.g. RIP checks, Cobra checks, etc.) in lieu of the cash. This case was investigated in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Treasury, Office of Criminal Investigations. On July 17, 2017, this matter was resolved pre-indictment by way of a guilty plea to an Accusation charging third degree Theft by Deception and third degree Failure to Pay state income taxes, with a recommended sentence of probation conditioned upon 364 days in the Burlington County Jail.

On September 21, 2018, the defendant was sentenced pursuant to the negotiated plea agreement before the Hon. Philip E. Haines, J.S.C. The defendant paid the entire restitution amount prior to sentencing.

STATE v. SARAH COON

The defendant, who resides on Buckingham Drive in Southampton (formerly Lumberton Twp.), was charged with misappropriating approximately \$900,000 from her former employer, Paul Davis Restoration (PDR). Sarah Coon was the bookkeeper/Office Manager for the business and diverted cash, paid personal and business American Express (AMEX) accounts with PDR funds and fraudulently obtained gasoline fleet cards with Wawa to fuel personal vehicles. This case was investigated in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Treasury, Office of Criminal Investigations.

On October 1, 2017, the defendant Sarah Coon pleaded guilty to second degree Theft by Deception and third degree Failure to Pay state income taxes.

On November 19, 2018, the defendant was sentenced to an aggregate sentence of five years in New Jersey state prison before the Hon. Philip E. Haines, J.S.C. As part of her sentence, the defendant is required to pay \$438,000 in restitution for all AMEX usage and to file amended NJ Tax Returns upon her release from custody.

Additionally, the Financial Crimes Unit has either taken the lead on, worked jointly with, or is currently working investigations with the following agencies:

FEDERAL AGENCIES AND ENTITIES

- United States Attorney's Office (Newark and Camden Field Offices)
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
- United States Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
- United States Department of the Treasury
- Department of Homeland Security, Immigrations & Custom Enforcement
- United States Postal Inspection Service (USPIS)
- United States Department of Agriculture
- United States Secret Service (USSS)
- Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (New York Office)
- Office of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C)

STATE AND COUNTY AGENCIES

- Burlington County Office of Consumer Affairs
- Burlington County Board of Social Services
- New Jersey Department of the Treasury, Division of Taxation
- New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness
- New Jersey Department of Human Services
- New Jersey Office of the Attorney General, Division of Criminal Justice
- New Jersey Office of the Attorney General, Division of Consumer Affairs
- New York City Police Department, Financial Crimes Unit
- Philadelphia District Attorney's Office, Economic Crimes Unit
- Philadelphia Police Department
- Pennsylvania State Police

GANG, GUN AND NARCOTICS TASK FORCE

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Narcotics Task Force (NTF) was organized in October 1987, pursuant to the Attorney General's Statewide Narcotics Action Plan (SNAP) for Narcotics Enforcement. In March 2008, the Narcotics Task Force's name was officially changed to the Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF), pursuant to New Jersey's Safe Streets - Safe Neighborhoods Initiative. The GGNTF is responsible for investigations leading to the arrest and conviction of individuals who violate the Comprehensive Drug Reform Act of New Jersey.

Beginning in 2014, Burlington County experienced the initial wave of the Opioid epidemic that has devastated much of the United States over the past five years. The consumption of opioids has resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of Burlington County overdose fatalities. From 2014 through 2018, Burlington County lost 488 people from drug overdose. Broken down by year, the overdose deaths are reflected as follows: 75 in 2014; 87 in 2015; 96 in 2016; 144 in 2017 and 161 in 2018. These statistics show significant annual percentage increases of 16%, 10%, 50%, and 12% in the number of

overdose deaths in Burlington County. The death toll from overdoses increased each year despite the lifesaving deployment of naloxone by EMS and Law Enforcement to assist suspected opioid overdose victims. Burlington County EMS and Law Enforcement deployed naloxone 556 times in 2015; 653 times in 2016; 914 times in 2017 and 1025 times in 2018. Deployments increased annually 17% from 2015-2016, 40% from 2016-2017 and 12% from 2017-2018.

In recognition of the deadly impact of the opioid crisis specifically, and narcotics trafficking in general, in Burlington County, Prosecutor Scott Coffina and the BCPO Executive staff assessed the allocation of personnel and the needs of the Office. The Office identified operation needs and deployed personnel to the GGNTF to address those needs. This reallocation of personnel resulted in the following staffing changes at the GGNTF: the unit was relocated to a new location and is housed in a 6,000-square foot facility that has a training class room, a large meeting room where we host bi-monthly Burlington County GGNTF Liaison meetings, a wiretap room and a conference room. The Unit personnel increased from one sergeant and five detectives to two sergeants and nine detectives coming under the command of a lieutenant and a captain.

Additionally, the Task Force Officer (TFO) program, which recruits municipal police officers to join the GGNTF and engage in GGNTF operations on a temporary basis, was expanded from one TFO to three TFOs during 2018. While assigned to the GGNTF, a TFO receives training in all aspects of narcotics investigations. They then return to their respective agencies and use their training and acquired knowledge to coordinate their own gang, gun or narcotics investigations. In 2018, the Burlington Township Police Department, the Pemberton Township Police Department, the Burlington City Police Department and the Mount Laurel Township Police Department participated in the TFO Program.

The Unit supervisor is responsible for the daily functions of the Unit, and with the assistance of a second assistant prosecutor, provides legal services to all Burlington County municipal police agencies and the New Jersey State Police.

With the addition of personnel, the GGNTF focused our investigative efforts on the needs of the Burlington County community; specifically by targeting those deemed to be "High Value Targets" such as known violent offenders engaged in drug and or gun trafficking/violence, those engaged in the distribution of heroin/opioids, and criminal organizations engaged in violence and or drug trafficking. We are now better able to simultaneously target multiple offenders conducting criminal activity in Burlington County. The GGNTF is making better use of intelligence-led policing to identify, target and intercept the individuals responsible for the distribution of narcotics and those responsible for gun violence. We have prioritized the pursuit of drug-induced death investigations and strict liability prosecutions. The GGNTF screens every overdose death with the objective of pursuing an investigation into the person(s) responsible for providing overdose death victims with the lethal dosage of drugs.

The GGNTF has also attempted multiple lifesaving outreach projects targeting the opioid user community. In November 2018, the BCPO launched “Operation Safe Overnight” in which we partnered with Virtua and some local police departments to train hotel/motel staff about the opioid epidemic, the impact it has had in Burlington County and the dangers it presents to their staff. We demonstrated the deployment of Naloxone and provided a free naloxone kit to all the properties that attended. We ultimately hope to make naloxone as prevalent as AEDs at Burlington County hotels/motels.

We also launched an initiative where GGNTF “surface” detectives reached out to every surviving naloxone recipient to steer them into treatment and to cultivate actionable intelligence related to street level opioid distribution.

The GGNTF now also hosts bi-monthly Burlington County GGNTF Liaison meetings for Burlington County law enforcement officers responsible for the investigation of crimes related to gangs, guns and narcotics investigations. We offer training and topical speakers at these meetings where we also discuss crime trends in Burlington County and have a round-robin discussion of specific trends and needs in each Burlington County jurisdiction. These meetings foster an atmosphere of cooperation amongst the various municipal, state and federal agencies that regularly attend.

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2018

STATE v. GREGORY CARLTON

In a cooperative investigation with the Atlantic County Prosecutor’s Office and the Evesham Township Police Department (ETPD), BCPO GGNTF detectives effectively dismantled a “ghost gun,” or homemade untraceable firearm operation.

Atlantic County law enforcement initially discovered that defendant Gregory Carlton was making and selling illegal untraceable guns from his home in Evesham Township, New Jersey to criminals unable to purchase guns through lawful means. Ghost guns present a particularly difficult and dangerous challenge to law enforcement because they do not have serial numbers and, unlike legally manufactured firearms, they are not entered into the NIBIN system at the time of their manufacture.

Atlantic County law enforcement involved the BCPO GGNTF in this case once it was determined that Carlton lived in Evesham Township in Burlington County. A controlled purchase of one of these ghost guns was conducted in Hammonton, New Jersey. During this controlled purchase, Carlton sold a ghost gun to a confidential informant. Carlton was arrested as a result of this controlled purchase and BCPO GGNTF detectives obtained a warrant to search Carlton’s residence.

The search of the residence resulted in the seizure of approximately thirty-seven guns in whole or part.

Carlton was charged with multiple counts related to the manufacture, possession, and sale of these illegal weapons.

This case was transferred to Atlantic County for prosecution.

STATE v. MAURICE HOWARD, et al.

Beginning in 2016, Burlington County Law Enforcement became aware of a large-scale marijuana distribution ring operating from various locations in Burlington and Camden Counties.

Investigation into this drug distribution operation revealed that defendant Maurice Howard was the leader of the organization. Law enforcement discovered that Howard had at least two residences: one in Cherry Hill, NJ and one in San Diego California and that Howard travelled extensively between Philadelphia and California.

An investigation into Howard's finances revealed that Howard was conducting numerous financial transactions between various bank accounts totaling several hundred thousand dollars per year despite reported employment paying approximately sixty thousand dollars a year. Detectives also discovered that Howard regularly made large cash withdrawals and had numerous associates making regular cash deposits into his accounts in amounts less than ten thousand dollars in an attempt to evade SEC reporting requirements and hide the source of the funds.

A wiretap investigation revealed that Howard was involved in the large-scale distribution of marijuana obtained from California.

Search warrants were executed at Howard's residence. A large amount of marijuana, financial documents, and electronic devices, among other items, were seized.

Howard was charged with Possession of a Controlled Dangerous Substance with the Intent to Distribute (Third Degree) and Money Laundering (First Degree).

Howard is pending indictment on those charges.

STATE v. JOHN VU

United States Postal Service (USPS) personnel notified Moorestown Township Police Department (MTPD) Officers and BCPO GGNTF detectives that a large quantity of ecstasy pills was scheduled to be delivered to the TD Bank in Moorestown, New Jersey. The pills were addressed to a name that did not match any employees of the TD Bank. Law enforcement officers, including USPS inspectors, MTPD officers, and BCPO GGNTF detectives arranged a controlled delivery of the ecstasy pills in order to determine the purchaser's identity.

The controlled delivery occurred, and John Vu took possession of the ecstasy pills. Vu was arrested and interviewed and admitted to purchasing and possessing the pills. Vu stated that the pills originated in Europe, and that he had utilized the "dark web" to purchase the ecstasy. Vu also admitted to selling ecstasy pills in the past and that he planned to sell the pills seized during this case. Vu also stated that he used cellular telephone payment applications to complete the narcotics transactions.

Detectives obtained records of Vu's payment applications and bank records and determined Vu profited significantly from the sale of narcotics.

The ecstasy pills were analyzed by the Burlington County Forensic Laboratory and determined to be ecstasy in a quantity of more than one half ounce, but less than 5 ounces.

Vu was charged with Possession of CDS with the Intent to Distribute (Second Degree).

STATE v. DAQUAN MARSHALL

On or about October 30, 2018 Burlington Township Police Department (BTPD) officers responded to 6 Central Avenue, Burlington Township for the report of a possible overdose. When officers arrived, they located Alexandra Kohfeldt within her boyfriend Ryan Rambo's bedroom. Kohfeldt never regained consciousness and later died at Lourdes Medical Center in Willingboro.

Officers searched the room in which they found Kohfeldt and located a syringe and a white wax fold stamped "Topgear" in blue ink. Officers learned that Kohfeldt had recently relapsed back into heroin use. Rambo advised officers that Kohfeldt commonly purchased the heroin in Trenton, NJ.

Kohfeldt's mother provided consent to search Kohfeldt's phone. The phone was forensically examined and multiple text message conversations pertaining to the purchase of heroin between Kohfeldt and the defendant were found on the iPhone.

Marshall was arrested on November 4, 2018 and charged with CDS distribution. Marshall was interviewed after arrest and admitted to selling CDS to Kohfeldt and to the undercover officers.

In January of 2019, a laboratory analysis of Kohfeldt's bodily fluids revealed that she died as a result of a fatal overdose of fentanyl.

In February of 2019, an analysis of both Marshall and Kohfeldt's cellular telephone records indicated that Kohfeldt traveled to Trenton, NJ just before her fatal overdose and met with Marshall, whose cellular phone was located in the same area of Trenton, NJ as Kohfeldt.

Marshall was charged with, and indicted for, Drug Induced Death, Possession of CDS with the Intent to Distribute, Possession of CDS, and Conspiracy to Distribute CDS.

STATE v. AUSTIN COOPER

On December 26, 2017, a 15-year-old female juvenile victim (M.M.) was found unconscious and unresponsive in the bedroom of her Evesham Township, New Jersey home by her father.

Evesham Township Police Department (ETPD) officers and medical personnel responded to M.M.'s residence and found that she had suffered from a probable heroin/opiate overdose.

M.M. was transported to Virtua Hospital, but never regained consciousness. M.M. was almost immediately airlifted to Children's Hospital of Pennsylvania and placed on life support. M.M. passed away on December 28, 2017 as a result of complications of drug toxicity.

A forensic analysis of her cellular telephone revealed that she had contacted the defendant, Austin Cooper to purchase heroin in the weeks leading up to her fatal overdose.

Law enforcement identified and located Cooper. GGNTF detectives and ETPD officers executed a search warrant at Cooper's residence and seized a distribution-level quantity of heroin, fentanyl, and electronic communication devices, including, but not limited to, a cellular telephone and laptop computer.

A forensic analysis of these devices revealed that Cooper had conducted internet searches around the time of M.M.'s death related to narcotics distribution and the avoidance of law enforcement investigative techniques. These searches included "How to get a girl addicted to heroin," "How to get people addicted to heroin," "How to cut fentanyl with heroin," and searches related to what kind of information law enforcement officers could obtain from a forensic search of a cellular telephone.

The forensic analysis also revealed multiple communications between Cooper and other parties during which Cooper stated that he was responsible for killing M.M. with a fatal dose of heroin. Despite believing that his narcotics had killed M.M., Cooper continued to buy and distribute heroin and fentanyl.

Laboratory analysis of M.M.'s bodily fluids and an autopsy of M.M. revealed that she died from an overdose of heroin.

Cooper was charged with, and indicted for, First Degree Drug Induced Death and multiple counts of Distribution of CDS/Possession of CDS/Possession of CDS with the Intent to Distribute based upon the narcotics seized and the time of the execution of the search warrant and the distribution of the fatal dose of heroin to M.M.

In April of 2019, Cooper pleaded guilty to one count of Drug Induced Death. In June of 2019, Cooper was sentenced to eight years in the care and custody of the New Jersey Department of Corrections, 85% of which must be served before he is eligible for parole.

H-BLOCK CRIMINAL STREET GANG INVESTIGATION

Members of this Trenton-based mostly juvenile criminal street gang were arrested in Burlington and Mercer Counties and multiple search warrants executed on the residences or locations utilized by members following the social media posting of a robbery and assault upon a victim (D.C.) and a reported accidental shooting of a juvenile victim (A.R.) by a juvenile suspect (A.C.) at a Willingboro Township car wash.

Law enforcement's concern was heightened again when a few days after the shooting and assault of A.C., H-Block Members were captured on social media brandishing firearms, including a Mac-11 automatic pistol, while riding in the rear of an Uber car.

Multiple firearms, including a Mac-11 automatic pistol, were seized as a result of these search warrants.

The investigation was led by BCPO GGNTF detectives and assisted by the Florence Township Police Department, the Mercer County Prosecutors Office, the Trenton City Police Department, the Willingboro Township Police Department, and the Pemberton Township Police Department.

H-Block has been effectively dismantled and rendered ineffectual. This case serves as a good example of pro-active, modern policing which serves the interests of the community.

GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT

The Grand Jury/Case Screening Unit reviews all cases in Burlington County in which an adult has been charged with an indictable offense or Disorderly Persons offense which was placed on a warrant. The majority of cases involving indictable charges are handled or prosecuted at the Superior Court level as indictable matters, although some may be downgraded and referred to municipal court for prosecution as well. Those cases already involving Disorderly Persons charges are returned to the municipal courts for resolution.

It is the responsibility of the assistant prosecutors in the Unit to screen all cases for factual and legal sufficiency. When additional issues are identified, or further investigation is warranted, the assistant prosecutors work with municipal police departments and county detectives to focus investigative resources and gather additional evidence. The assistant prosecutors also assist police officers with initial charging decisions. Once a case has been thoroughly screened and investigated, it is the responsibility of the unit's assistant prosecutors to present the cases to the Grand Jury. From there, the case is passed onto the Trial Team Unit.

In addition to screening each case, the assistant prosecutors in the unit administer the Pre-Indictment Program, referred to in this county as PIP. PIP is an alternative disposition tool for criminal matters which allows for possible pre-indictment resolutions of cases which might otherwise have been presented to the Grand Jury.

An indictable charge can be resolved by way of a plea to an accusation, with some occasionally being resolved for a lesser disorderly person offense.

Another facet of the Grand Jury/Screening Unit is the Drug Court Program. Drug Court is a program for eligible defendants which focuses on treatment and rehabilitation as an alternative to incarceration. The program is for those defendants who commit not only drug offenses, but other crimes motivated by drug addiction. The Drug Court assistant prosecutor reviews every Drug Court application, represents the State's interests to ensure that only qualified defendants are admitted, and prosecutes defendants within the parameters of Drug Court.

The Screening/Grand Jury Unit consists of the supervisor, a Drug Court assistant prosecutor, a designated Dangerous Offenders Section assistant prosecutor, four Screening/Grand Jury assistant prosecutors, one detective, a lieutenant, two prosecutor's agents, and five members of the clerical support staff.

Beginning on January 1, 2017, New Jersey implemented the Bail Reform system, a sweeping restructuring to the state's prior monetary bail system. This reform was voted into existence in the 2014 election as an Amendment to the New Jersey state Constitution.

In summary,

The Bail Reform Law replaces the current resource-based system with a 'risk-based' approach, requiring courts to assess the likelihood that a defendant will flee, commit new criminal activity, or obstruct justice by intimidating victims and other witnesses. [T]his

predictive process...[is] informed by an objective pretrial risk-assessment process that has been designed and validated through empirical research. See N.J.S.A. 2A:162-25(c). The use of a validated pretrial risk assessment instrument represents a major advance toward a just and effective pretrial release system.

From the law enforcement perspective, of course, the most important feature of the Bail Reform Law is that dangerous defendants can be detained by court order. Consistent with law enforcement's core mission, our principal goal in implementing the new statute is to protect the safety of the community, victims, and witnesses. It is especially imperative to ensure that criminal justice reforms safeguard the rights of crime victims, including their state constitutional and statutory right to participate in the criminal justice process and to have meaningful input in prosecutorial decisions that affect their interests.

[Christopher S. Porrino, Attorney General, Directive Establishing Interim Policies, Practices, and Procedures to Implement Criminal Justice Reform Pursuant to P.L. 2014, e. 31, http://www.nj.gov/oag/dci/agguide/directives/2016-6_Law-Enforcement.pdf (2018)].

Before the advent of Bail Reform, defendants charged with even the most serious offenses were entitled to bail and were often released within hours of being arrested. Those defendants who could not make bail were held in jail until the resolution of their matter. This often adversely impacted poorer defendants who could not afford even a minimal bail. Now, with the advent of bail reform, those defendants deemed the most dangerous to society or the most likely to commit a new offense can be detained without bail pending the resolution of their case. These Bail Reform laws have dramatically reduced the jail population across the state.

What is more, the impact of these laws on public safety has been slight. In the years prior to bail reform, released defendants showed up for 92.7% of pretrial court appearances, 12.7% of them were subsequently charged with a new indictable offense, and 11.5% were charged with a new disorderly persons offense. In the first year of bail reform alone, released defendants showed up for 89.4% of court appearances, 13.7% were charged with a new indictable offense, and 13.2% were charged with a new disorderly persons offense.

Implementation of the Bail Reform laws, however, has led to an exponential increase in workload for the staff of this Office. Under the Bail Reform system, each defendant who is arrested on a warrant must have a First Appearance before a judge within 48 hours of arrest. In order to meet this requirement, First Appearances occur Monday through Saturday. In addition to appearing in court, the Assistant Prosecutors handling the First Appearances must prepare each of the cases for this initial hearing, which includes reading and summarizing the facts of the case and the defendant's criminal history, determining which defendants should be detained, and filing all required motions for such detention. A defendant whom the State has moved to detain is required to have his or her detention hearing scheduled and heard within three business days. Each detention hearing consists of oral argument by both the State and defense counsel, submission of multiple pieces of evidence, and then a ruling by the judge. These hearings occur on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays each week. Assistant prosecutors in the

Screening/Grand Jury Unit handle all detention motions filed within this county, with the exception of a few cases handled by Assistant Attorneys General.

Every defendant who remains detained following his or her detention hearing must have his or her case either indicted by the Grand Jury or resolved within 90 days. The detective and prosecutor's agent assigned to this Bail Reform sub-unit (or the "Dangerous Offenders section" as it is called in this Office) are responsible for ensuring that each file is ready for then detention hearing and then, if the defendant is detained, further readying the case for presentment to the Grand Jury. In 2018, the detective and agent assigned to the Dangerous Offenders Section prepared almost 1,200 cases for detention hearings and indictment.

The other two case agents and the detective assigned to the Screening/Grand Jury Unit prepared another 1,063 cases for indictment. In 2018, the assistant prosecutors of the unit processed over 4,990 indictable defendants and an additional approximately 500 defendants facing only Disorderly Persons charges who were charged on a warrant, and therefore, required a First Appearance. The number of indictable defendants handled by the Office increased approximately 3% from 2017, and approximately 11% from 2016.

The assistant prosecutors also indicted 1,413 defendants and pled 461 defendants by way of Accusation in 2018. This is approximately 28% and 39% more defendants indicted or resolved by accusation, respectively, than in 2017.

HIGH-TECH CRIMES/DIGITAL FORENSIC UNIT

The High-Tech Crimes and Digital Forensics Unit conducts investigations into crimes that involve the use of high-end technology such as computers, cellular telephones, telecommunications equipment and other advanced technology. In particular, the unit examines devices connected to offenses involving the exploitation of children, network intrusion, hacking and DNS attacks. The unit is staffed by two Detectives and a Detective Sergeant, who is the investigative Supervisor.

The unit is a member the New Jersey State Police Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force and the New Jersey State Police Cyber Terrorism Task Force.

The High-Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit has assisted the various units of the Prosecutor's Office, along with local, state and federal agencies with search warrants and digital forensic examinations, to include computers, digital cameras, USB flash drives, Digital Video Recorder (DVR) systems, cellular telephones, iPods, iPads, tablets and GPS devices.

The High-Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit has a three-prong mission:

1. Online Undercover Activity: To proactively investigate criminal activity perpetrated over the Internet or aided by the use of computer or data communications technology.

2. Data Forensics: To apply the scientific method and acceptable scientific standards to the preservation, identification, extraction, documentation, and interpretation of computer data and other digital evidence in an effort to prosecute the guilty and exonerate the innocent.
3. Education Initiative: To educate the citizens, children, and business community of Burlington County on the current trends of crime committed through the use of the Internet or other computer or data communications technology and to provide methods and tools to avoid becoming the victim of such crime.

For the first component, investigators operate in an undercover capacity in an effort to identify sexual predators, frauds and scams, criminal organizations, online narcotics activity, child prostitution and pornography, hackers, terrorist organizations and other felonious activity facilitated through the use of the Internet and other data communications technology.

The second component involves forensically processing digital evidence for Burlington County law enforcement agencies, performing computer forensic examinations, and capturing and analyzing data that may be of evidentiary value to a criminal investigation.

The final component involves working with law enforcement agencies, parents and students to provide instruction on Internet safety and appropriate Internet behavior for children.

In 2018, the High-Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit assisted in 680 digital forensic examinations, on over 485 different pieces of evidence, to include computers, digital cameras, USB flash drives, cellular telephones, small scale digital devices, tablet, GPS devices, Digital Video recorder (DVR) systems and Vehicular Infotainment systems.

The High-Tech Crimes Unit conducted 11 Internet Safety Presentations, relating to Basic Internet Safety, Cyberbullying and Sexting. The presentations were mainly to students at various schools throughout Burlington County. Some presentations were to parents and also as part of the Burlington County Sheriff's Youth Police Academy.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE V. DONOVAN BALTHAZOR

As part of the New Jersey Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC), the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated an investigation based upon a cyber tip report from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) regarding the uploading of child sexual abuse files to a Google Gmail account associated with Donovan Balthazor. The IP address that was used to upload the images came back to a residence in Pemberton Township.

The High-Tech Crimes Unit obtained multiple court orders for email addresses associated with Balthazor which revealed he was actively trading child pornography with others and

portraying himself as a juvenile female. A search warrant was ultimately served at the residence by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police - Digital Technology Investigation Unit, the United State Air Force – Office of Special Investigations, United States Homeland Security Investigations and the Pemberton Township Police Department. Donovan Balthazor was located at work in Joint Base MDL and taken into custody. Donovan Balthazor pled to one count of Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Distribution of Child Porn). Balthazor is pending sentencing. The case was investigated by Detective Sergeant Dave Kohler.

STATE V. ROBERT SOUTH

As part of the New Jersey Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC), the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated an investigation based upon a cyber tip report from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) regarding the uploading of child sexual abuse files to a Microsoft OneDrive account associated with Robert South. The IP address that was used to upload the images came back to a residence in Southampton Township.

The High-Tech Crimes Unit obtained multiple court orders for email addresses and cloud storage associated with South which revealed he possessed a large quantity of child pornography. A search warrant was ultimately served at the residence by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police - Digital Technology Investigation Unit and Red Lion Barracks, and United States Homeland Security Investigations. Robert South was charged with Possession of Child Pornography. He has been indicted by a Grand Jury for Possession of Child Pornography over 1000 files but less than 100,000. The case was investigated by Det. Jennifer Appelman.

STATE V. ALAN BERMAN

As part of the New Jersey Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC), the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated an investigation based upon a cyber tip report from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) regarding juvenile male from Arkansas who was chatting online with an adult male, later identified as Alan Berman. The tip related that Berman was asking the 15-year-old to send nude images of himself and that the adult male was possibly a police officer. Berman was employed as a Campus Security Officer at Rider University and also a volunteer fire captain in his hometown of Bordentown City.

Communication Data Warrants were obtained for Berman's Liveme account, which revealed he was chatting online with numerous individuals who were believed to be underage.

A search warrant was ultimately served at a residence in Bordentown City by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police - Digital Technology Investigation Unit, United States Homeland Security Investigations and the Bordentown City Police Department. Detectives were able to obtain a confession

from Berman relating to the child pornography as well as admitting to ownership of the Liveme account.

Based upon the arrest, several parents reached out to law enforcement regarding their children spending a lot time and sleeping over at Berman's residence. Over the course of the following two weeks, 7 juvenile males ranging from 12-15 years old were interviewed at the Child Advocacy Center. Several of the males disclosed sexual contact by Berman, allowed access to a Firearm and were provided with Marijuana.

Berman was ultimately charged with 11 additional counts to include Sexual Assault, Endangering the Welfare of a Child, and Obscenity to a Minor. Berman pled guilty to an accusation of Possession of Child Pornography over 1000 files and Endangering the Welfare of a Child and is pending sentencing. The case was investigated by Det. Kevin Sobotka.

STATE V. HOWARD IRIZARRY

As part of the New Jersey Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC), the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated a proactive investigation based upon an individual using a Peer-2-Peer file sharing program to distribute Child Pornography. The IP address came back to a residence in Maple Shade Township.

The High-Tech Crimes Unit obtained a search warrant for a residence in Maple Shade Township to seize and search diverse electronic devices. A search warrant was ultimately served at the residence by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police Digital Technology Investigations Unit, United States Homeland Security Investigations and the Maple Shade Township Police Department. A forensic examination of the digital items seized was conducted by the High-Tech Crimes Unit, who ultimately located thousands of child sexual abuse images and videos on devices utilized by Howard Irizarry.

Irizarry was charged with Distribution of Child Pornography, Possession of Child Pornography with Intent to Distribute, Use of a File Sharing Program to Store Child Pornography and Possession of Child Pornography. Irizarry pled guilty to an accusation of Distribution of Child Pornography and is pending sentencing. The case was investigated by Detective Sergeant Dave Kohler.

STATE V. JEREMY BECKER

In September 2017, the High-Tech Crimes Unit was requested to conduct a Cyber related investigation, based upon a conflict of interest out of Moorestown Police Department. The target of the investigation was Jeremy Becker, who had been arrested by Moorestown police for Bias Intimidation and Cyber-Harassment of a family residing in Moorestown.

After this arrest, Becker then turned his harassment towards members of the Moorestown Police Department, to include the arresting officer and the chief of police and continued the harassment to the family in Moorestown.

Becker was ultimately arrested on seven total charges to include second degree Filing of False Reports to Incriminate Another. Becker ultimately pled guilty to the charges in exchange for a five-year term in New Jersey state prison.

Upon being released, as the sentence was suspended, Becker immediately started with his harassment again. Law enforcement was able to obtain search warrants for his residence along with his parents. Becker was arrested at his residence and was served with additional charges of cyber-harassment and contempt. Becker was indicted by a grand jury on numerous charges relating to this case, which was investigated by Det. Kevin Sobotka.

HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT

The BCPO Homeland Security Unit is a sub-section of the Major Crimes Unit – Violent Crimes Section. The role of the Homeland Security Unit is to deter, detect and prevent acts of terrorism. There is one detective sergeant, one detective and an analyst assigned to the Homeland Security Unit. The detective sergeant serves as the Burlington County Counter-Terrorism Coordinator. Major Crimes Unit detectives provide investigative support to the Homeland Security Unit, when necessary.

The Burlington County Counter-Terrorism Coordinator (CCTC) is tasked with the duties of investigating suspected acts of terrorism and collecting and disseminating counter-terrorism related intelligence to the municipal police departments, the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness (OHSP) and the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF). The CCTC works closely with OHSP, the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force, the Burlington County Office of Emergency Management and other state and county organizations to share information and provide training to municipal police agencies and private security forces to better protect critical infrastructure and key assets throughout Burlington County.

Other duties of the CCTC include the identification and evaluation of critical infrastructures and key assets within Burlington County, and maintaining data on these sites and their appropriate points of contact. This data is entered into state databases through OHSP. In conjunction with OHSP and New Jersey State Police, the CCTC is tasked with assessing the identified critical infrastructures and key assets that are vulnerable to terrorist attacks. The CCTC also makes recommendations to harden these critical sites against any terrorist activity.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT

The Information Systems Unit (ISU) was staffed during 2018 by a Supervising Data Control Clerk, who performs a multitude of duties to assist staff with investigative and prosecutorial pursuits.

Duties include data entry of case notes, printing reports, and maintaining the inventory and security of the PROMIS/GAVEL System in accordance with the procedures established by the Administrative Office of the Courts. ISU personnel are designated to access the Criminal Justice Information System to obtain state and federal criminal histories as well as drivers' license abstracts. Additional duties performed by the ISU staff include maintaining adult criminal files as well as implementing enhancements to the Burlington County Mainframe Systems. ISU is responsible for scanning all mail and other documents that pertain to prosecutor adult case files. During 2018, ISU scanned more than 100,000 documents.

ISU is responsible for the retention of records as well the destruction of records in compliance with procedures and timetables established by the State Division of Archives and Records Management. The Unit also handles billing from the Burlington County Mainframe Systems. The BCPO office manager supervises the Information Systems Unit, which is also tasked with completing special projects assigned to fulfill the investigative and prosecutorial mission of the BCPO.

INSURANCE FRAUD UNIT

The Insurance Fraud Unit is funded primarily by the Insurance Fraud Reimbursement Program through the New Jersey Office of the Attorney General, Division of Criminal Justice, and Office of the Insurance Fraud Prosecutor (OIFP).

The Insurance Fraud Unit investigates all forms of insurance and insurance-related fraud including, but not limited to, health care, auto, homeowner's insurance, workers' compensation, simulated motor vehicle cards and arson. The Unit also provides investigative assistance to local police agencies. One assistant prosecutor, one detective, and one secretary are assigned to the Unit.

The Insurance Fraud Unit investigates and prosecutes cases on a vertical prosecution model, handling cases from inception to sentencing. Cases are developed from information provided by municipal police departments, insurance company anti-fraud units, the OIFP, the New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs, the New Jersey Motor Vehicle Commission, the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services and information from concerned citizens.

In 2018, the Insurance Fraud Unit expanded the proactive initiative of working directly with Motor Vehicle Commission investigators targeting and investigating individuals fraudulently registering their motor vehicles in Burlington County. This initiative continues to lead to more investigations and the development of cases with stronger proofs.

The Insurance Fraud Unit also voluntarily developed and implemented a training presentation as part of the semi-annual Criminal Investigation Course which is offered to investigators throughout the county and the surrounding region. Course instruction also provides the platform to implement a new county-wide Prescription Fraud Form which better facilitates the investigation and prosecution of related insurance crimes.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE V. DONALD HORNER

On October 1, 2018, Donald Horner was arrested by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Insurance Fraud Unit and charged with Insurance Fraud and other related charges. The arrest of Donald Horner was the result of an investigation conducted by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, Insurance Fraud Unit. On June 26, 2018, investigators with the New Jersey Office of Emergency Management met with the BCPO Insurance Fraud Unit to discuss an alleged fraud committed by Delran Emergency Squad Chief Donald Horner. State Investigators received a tip that Horner was continuing to work on ambulances responding to calls, transporting patients, and billing for services without an active EMT certification. Under the State licensure agreement for EMS agencies, two certified EMTs must be on the ambulance in order to bill for services. According to State Investigators that went to Delran Emergency Squad in order to investigate the alleged offense, Horner made threats directed at them.

Over the course of the investigation, the BCPO Insurance Fraud Unit conducted numerous interviews and acquired records that contained audit trails showing all of Horner's activity within the patient care reporting system used for each patient contact/bill. The audit trails showed that Horner would log in and alter patient care reports by removing his name off as a provider and add in a certified EMT who was not originally on the care report. The investigation concluded that 27 patient care reports had been altered by Horner. Out of these 27 patient care reports, 11 were used to bill private insurance providers \$9,845.50 which led to Delran Emergency Squad receiving payment in the amount of \$3,728.34.

On May 6, 2019, Donald Horner pled guilty to an accusation for Insurance Fraud (Third Degree) and Tampering with Public Records (Third Degree) for a negotiated sentence of 364 days in the Burlington County Jail, 200 hours of community service, forfeiture of his EMT certification for life, restitution, and mandatory fines and penalties.

STATE V. DIANDRE CHANDLER

On April 24, 2018 Diandre Chandler was indicted for Insurance Fraud (Third Degree). The investigation originated with a referral by the OIFP which was received by the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Insurance Fraud Unit on March 20, 2018 and involved a suspicious motor vehicle accident claim. A claim was submitted to Personal Service Insurance by Budget Rental Cars on behalf of their client, Diandre Chandler. The

claim received by Personal Service Insurance was flagged as suspicious due to the fact that a tow slip indicated that the motor vehicle accident had happened two days prior to the submission of the claim, and one day prior to the inception of the defendant's car insurance policy.

The BCPO Insurance Fraud Unit acquired the original motor vehicle accident report, tow slips, and the incident report submitted by Diandre Chandler. These documents revealed that the rental vehicle was being driven by Diandre Chandler's girlfriend Natasha Phelps, who was involved in a motor vehicle accident involving a fixed object in South Brunswick, NJ on April 16, 2017. The accident report showed that Phelps was the driver, and there were no other occupants. The impound receipt also showed April 16, 2017 as the date of the accident. Chandler then opened a policy with Personal Service Insurance on April 18, 2017, and reported the accident as occurring on April 19, 2017, with him as the driver.

On December 3, 2018, Diandre Chandler pled guilty to Insurance Fraud (Third Degree) and was subsequently sentenced to probation, ordered to pay \$5000 in restitution to Budget Rental Cars and also ordered to pay mandatory fines and penalties.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT

In 2006, the Intelligence Services Unit (ISU) was established and shortly thereafter later utilized funds from a federal grant award and funding approved by the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders to purchase the Infoshare Intelligence Management module, along with various other software programs, peripherals, and equipment. The intelligence module can support and enhance law enforcement efforts at the local, county and federal levels. With an intelligence management system in place, the Intelligence Services Unit satisfied the requirements of federal guidelines 28 CFR Part 23, as well as the New Jersey Attorney General Intelligence Guidelines.

In 2018, ISU was comprised of one detective sergeant and a trained analyst as a prosecutor's agent. ISU is an active member of the Burlington County Gang Task Force and is responsible for coordinating the quarterly Gang Task Force meetings and administering the Annual Gang Seminar training. Its members teach blocks of instruction on intelligence and gang awareness. They provide training to municipal, county and state law enforcement, school administrators, students, and officials from Joint Base McGuire – Dix – Lakehurst. They also provide semi-annual training for the County's Advanced Criminal Investigations Course, along with assisting and scheduling 28 CFR Part 23 training and Intelligence Module training. ISU produces intelligence products to include a bi-monthly intelligence brief, flow charts, timelines, link, telephone and GPS analysis, and continuous county-wide gang threat assessments. Part of ISU's mission is to identify gangs, members, associates, trends, locations and potential hotspots for criminal activity, in addition to providing support in the courtroom with regards to gang identification and methods of communication. To date, 30 Burlington County municipal police agencies participate in the Infoshare Intelligence Sharing Program with a total of 64 police officers and detectives from the various agencies having access to the database.

The Intelligence Services Unit receives various types of intelligence from numerous sources including but not limited to:

Bureau of Prisons	McGuire Joint Base Dix Lakehurst
Confidential Informants / sources	Municipal Police Departments
County Prosecutor's Offices	National Fusion Centers
County Jails	Division of Criminal Justice
New Jersey Department of Corrections	New Jersey State Parole
El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC)	New Jersey State Police
Federal Law Enforcement Agencies	MAGLOCLLEN/RISS
Federal Probation	National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C)
Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Forces	Open Source Intelligence (O.S.I.N.T.)
New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness	

ISU coordinates the bi-monthly Violent Enterprise Source Targeting (V.E.S.T.) meetings. The U.S. Attorney's Office developed the program in an effort to coordinate, assist and prosecute local violent offenders at the federal level. The program's target audience is command staff members from the local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. The meeting provides information on current crime data, trends, intelligence, significant arrest, and current investigations.

ISU is responsible for conducting deconfliction training to Burlington County municipal departments. Deconfliction is used on all investigations and is designed to make sure there are no parallel investigations on the same target by another law enforcement agency. This, in turn, ensures safety for officers who work in an uncover capacity. The deconfliction process is conducted through web-based access to the Philadelphia / Camden High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (H.I.D.T.A) and the NY/NJ H.I.D.T.A., which then connects with numerous other deconfliction systems.

ISU is also responsible for providing blocks of instruction on gang awareness to schools, to include students and school administrators.

In July 2014, the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Intelligence Services Unit commenced tracking Naloxone deployments by law enforcement in Burlington County. In 2016, there were 195 Naloxone deployments by Burlington County law enforcement. In 2017, there were 346 Naloxone deployments resulting in 309 saves. In 2018 there were 571 Naloxone deployments resulting in 470 saves. These numbers do not include deployments by EMS personnel.

MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – SPECIAL VICTIMS SECTION

The Major Crimes Unit – Special Victims Section is comprised of two assistant prosecutors, one sergeant and five detectives. The Unit investigates all crimes involving sexual or physical abuse against children by adult and juvenile offenders and is involved with investigations of potential pedophiles, child pornography, and cases involving occupational/professional offenders.

The Unit was created in 1986 in response to the increased identification and reporting of crimes involving the victims of child sexual assault and child abuse. This increase was the result of educational programs in the early 1980s that provided the public with a heightened awareness of these crimes. It became evident that special investigative techniques, as well as a different investigative and prosecutorial approach, were needed to successfully investigate, prosecute and care for the child victim. Each detective receives specialized training in interviewing the victims of sexual assault and physical child abuse.

In 1989, the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) approach to investigation and prosecution was implemented in Burlington County. This approach couples the detectives and prosecutors with mental health agencies, the state Department of Children and Families, and educational and medical professionals. The purpose of the MDT approach is to minimize the impact of the criminal investigation on an already traumatized child victim. The MDT provides both pre- and post-prosecution assistance.

CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER

The Director of the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) of the BCPO coordinates the MDT process. The Child Advocacy Center is staffed by a director and a caseworker and provides a child-friendly atmosphere for the victim upon being introduced to the criminal justice process. All juvenile victims of first- or second-degree child sexual assault or physical abuse that occur in Burlington County are interviewed at this facility. The MDT approach was established to place the child victim's interests as paramount from the inception of the investigation to ensure that the victim receives supportive care during the course of the prosecution process. The staff of the Child Advocacy Center offers these services to victims and their families regardless of whether the defendant is prosecuted criminally.

MEGAN'S LAW UNIT

The Megan's Law Unit, consisting of one assistant prosecutor and one detective, also falls within the purview of the Major Crimes Unit – Special Victims Section. The Megan's Law Unit works closely with the Major Crimes Unit – Special Victims Section and local law enforcement liaisons to monitor and track the whereabouts of convicted sexual offenders. The Megan's Law Unit is responsible for assigning an initial "tier" designation to each registrant convicted of certain sexually-related offenses by assessing their risk of re-offense under guidelines promulgated by the Attorney General and the Courts. After

the Court approves a registrant's tier designation, the unit provides notification to law enforcement, community organizations, schools and the general public where appropriate. The unit also prosecutes offenders charged with violating their registration and supervision requirements under Megan's Law. Together, these three entities of the BCPO and law enforcement authorities strive to protect and help the children and citizens of Burlington County.

SART/SANE COORDINATOR

The SART/SANE Coordinator is responsible for the recruitment, training and supervision of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANE) who contract with the County to provide the medical forensic exams to victims of sexual assault. The coordinator is the liaison to the five participating Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) sites, four hospitals, with separate pediatric pavilion managed by Children's Hospital of Pennsylvania at Virtua Memorial in Mount Holly. Additionally, the SANE Coordinator maintains chain-of-custody for all evidence, writes policies and procedures, maintains case files, communicates with law enforcement agencies, trains participating community partners and oversees the response of the Sexual Assault Response Team. The coordinator reviews each case, response time and provides feedback to nurses on their roles as a SANE.

Currently 10 SANE nurses conduct exams. SANEs conduct medical forensic exams on victims of sexual abuse throughout the lifespan. In cases of chronic sexual abuse, an exam is done if the most recent abuse has occurred within five days of the exam. The purpose of the exam is to medically assess the victim (male or female), collect forensic evidence, document injuries or findings, take forensic photographs, provide medications to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections provide counseling and referrals, maintain chain-of-custody, and testify at trial.

During 2018, the SART/SANE program was responsible for responding to 104 calls and conducting 80 forensic examinations of individuals reporting being victims of sexual assault at the five exam sites in Burlington County.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE V. HARRY THOMAS

In December 2017, a young girl disclosed that Thomas had sexually assaulted her between the ages of 5 and 9. After this was reported, other young girls also revealed that they were sexually assaulted by Thomas. All victims were between the approximate ages of 4 and 10 years old when the abusive behavior occurred and each believed at the time that they were the only victim of Thomas. The most recent assault occurred two to three years prior to the first disclosure. It should also be noted that Thomas was the Pastor of Come Alive Church in Medford Twp.

On February 16, 2018 Thomas pled guilty to one count of Aggravated Sexual Assault (First Degree), three counts of Sexual Assault (Second Degree) and one count of

Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Second Degree). On July 27, 2018, Thomas was sentenced to 18 years in New Jersey state prison with 18 years of parole ineligibility.

STATE V. JERMAINE WARD

On June 24, 2018, it was reported by a friend of Jermaine Ward's that she observed a video on Ward's cell phone which showed his hand touching the vagina of a young child. After a joint investigation involved the Maple Shade Police Department and the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, it was determined the child was four years old.

The defendant was long-time friend of the victim's family. Also observed on the phone were images of young unclothed boys. Ward was questioned and admitted to touching the female child who he referred to as his "cousin." He also admitted to watching boys and sometimes girls in the bathroom on more than one occasion. He admitted to filming two boys in the bathroom at his former school in Camden County. He admitted to being attracted to children.

The defendant pled guilty to Aggravated Sexual Assault (First Degree) and was sentenced on March 22, 2019 to the negotiated sentence of 17 years in New Jersey state prison with 17 years of parole ineligibility.

MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – VIOLENT CRIMES SECTION

In 2018, the investigative staff of the Major Crimes Unit was merged with the investigative staff of the Sexual Assault Child Abuse Unit. The new Major Crimes Unit is now comprised of two sections, the Violent Crimes Section and the Special Victims section. Detectives assigned to the Major Crimes Unit investigate both types of crime.

The Major Crimes Unit - Violent Crimes Section has as its primary function the investigation of homicides and other violent or serious crimes, such as aggravated assault, robbery and arson, as well as large scale criminal operations. The MCU - Violent Offenders Section also supports other BCPO investigative units, including Special Investigations and Financial Crimes, in cases such as police-involved shootings and frauds, respectively. The MCU - Violent Crimes Section operates in conjunction with the Collision and Analysis Reconstruction Unit, and also supports the Homeland Security Unit When Needed.

The Major Crimes Unit - Violent Crimes Section consists of a supervising assistant prosecutor, one assistant prosecutor, one captain, one lieutenant, two detective sergeants, and nine detectives. As stated above the investigative personnel also investigate sex and child abuse cases.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE V. CHRISTOPHER COSTELLO & BRYAN COSTELLO

On October 31, 2016, Justin DuBois, who was the subject of an ongoing narcotics investigation, was reported missing by his mother to the West Windsor Police Department. The last time that she heard from her son was on October 27th at approximately 7 pm. Investigation revealed that DuBois was staying at 7 Spencer Court in Lumberton and the BCPO Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force was set to execute search warrants on the residence and vehicle belonging to DuBois.

As part of the narcotics investigation, on October 28th DuBois' car was followed to the Lowes store in Hainesport New Jersey. Subsequent review of the surveillance video from the store revealed that Christopher Costello was operating the victim's vehicle and took it to Lowes, where he purchased three rakes, contractor bags, a pick axe, two shovels and two pairs of gloves. Christopher Costello then re-entered the victim's car and drove away.

On November 2nd, the victim's girlfriend Deja Jones was interviewed. Jones stated that she last spoke to DuBois on October 27th and that she spoke to Bryan Costello at 7 Spencer Court in Lumberton on November 1st. At that time, Bryan stated that he had not seen or heard from the victim in some time. On November 3rd officers went to 7 Spencer Court and met with Robert Costello, owner of the residence.

Robert invited the officers in and provided consent to the officers to check the residence for DuBois. Both of Robert's sons Christopher and Bryan were then interviewed. Each of the suspects stated that they had not seen or heard from Dubois since the 26th or 27th of October. Search warrants were then obtained for the home.

As a result of the search warrant for 7 Spencer Court, a backpack belonging to the victim was located in the basement of the residence. Inside this backpack were several articles of clothing that appeared to be blood stained. Additionally, the victim's broken I-phone was recovered. In the back yard of the property an 8 x10 foot area that appeared to have been freshly dug was located.

An additional warrant was obtained permitting the excavation of this area. As a result of the excavation Justin Dubois' body was recovered wrapped in bedding materials and a blue canvas tarp. The autopsy revealed that the victim had trauma to the right side of the head and what appeared to be bruising on the hands. A search of the defendant's cell phones revealed text messages about the police coming to the house as part of the missing person investigation and not saying anything that would be incriminating. Both brothers were indicted on murder charges.

A motion to suppress each defendants statement was granted on October 13th by Judge Covert who found that the each of the brothers were in custody and should have been advised of their Miranda warnings when the statements were given.

Christopher Costello's trial began on February 22, 2018. On March 14, 2018, the jury found Chris not guilty of murder and were deadlocked on the lesser included offense of aggravated manslaughter. The jury also found defendant guilty of desecration of human remains and hindering apprehension.

On April 9th Bryan entered a plea to aggravated manslaughter in exchange for 15 years in New Jersey state prison, 85% without parole. In his factual basis, he indicated that his brother was not involved in the homicide but Christopher's testimony at trial conflicted with some of the details in Bryan's factual basis. Retrial of Christopher began on July 24, 2018. At the conclusion of trial Christopher Costello was convicted of aggravated manslaughter and sentenced to 20 years in New Jersey state prison, 85% of which to be served without parole. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutors Louis Casadia and Robert Van Gilst.

STATE V. WILLIAM GENNETT

July 6, 2016, at approximately 9 a.m., Lumberton police respond to a 9-1-1 call for an unconscious and unresponsive female at 47 Nassau Road in Lumberton. Upon arrival police found 45-year-old Shannon O'Rourke lying in the living room with blood coming from her ear.

The 911 caller was William Gennett who stated he was with the victim until approximately 9 p.m. on July 5th and he returned at approximately 9:00 a.m. on July 6th to let a dog out that she was pet sitting. When police arrived the back door to the residence was found to be kicked or shouldered in. The interior of the house was immaculate with no evidence of a struggle. The autopsy determined that the cause of death was manual strangulation.

The only items known to be missing from the residence were the victim's cell phone, driver's license and bank/credit cards. Friends report that the victim went everywhere with her cell phone. Warrants were obtained for the victim's phone and a security system that the victim had at the home, as well as Gennett's phone. Gennett was cooperative, allowing a consent search of his phone, car and the room in which he was staying. Gennett also allowed photos of his person to be taken to check for any signs of injury.

Further investigation revealed that Gennett had been stalking the victim. Gennett installed an application on O'Rourke's smart phone that allowed him to track her whereabouts without her knowing. Additionally, it was discovered that on several occasions he called police to report erratic driving on the victim's behalf. Records indicate that when these calls were made by Gennett he was several miles away from O'Rourke's location and could not have observed her driving, yet he knew her exact location. Records from AT&T Mobility who maintained the residential alarm for the victim's residence indicated discrepancies in some of the initial details provided by Gennett. Specifically, a glass break sensor was activated at a time when the defendant indicated that he was at the residence.

Further, the front door camera to the residence went offline one minute after the glass break sensor was activated. Based upon the statements taken from the defendant and the records received by the alarm company it appears that the defendant strangled the victim and then staged a break-in to cover the crime. The defendant, who was present when the security system was installed, then deactivated the front door camera so that he would not be captured when he left the residence.

Initially Gennett denied knowing anything about who was stalking the victim. When confronted with the information known to investigators he indicated that the victim knew about the stalking application that had been placed on her phone. He also admitted to placing several calls to police resulting in her being pulled over. During the interview, he was locked into a time line that places him at the residence at the time the glass break sensor went off on the victim's back door which is the door that was damaged during this incident. When the defendant was pressed further he requested a lawyer. Defendant was charged with murder and stalking and arrested at a home in Tabernacle on February 8, 2017.

At the time of the arrest the defendant suffered a medical emergency and was admitted to Memorial Hospital in Mount Holly. The defendant was later released from the hospital and detained pending trial. The defendant was indicted on May 4, 2017, on charges of murder and stalking. On June 20, 2018, the defendant was convicted at trial of murder and stalking. He was sentenced to 30 years in prison without parole. This case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutors Robert Van Gilst and Courtney O'Brien.

STATE V. DAVID STEAD

On July 1, 2016, at approximately 4:30 p.m., the New Jersey State Police were dispatched to 157 Patty Bowker Road in reference to a well-being check. Upon arrival troopers found the victim, Thomas Wright Jr. lying unconscious on the floor of the living room with blood covering his face and a pool of blood under his head and body.

In a separate room of the residence five .22 caliber shell casings and a shattered mirror were lying on the floor of the residence. There was also an unopened wall safe in the room with the mirror and the desk in that room appeared to have been rummaged through. Several items were found to be missing from the residence to include a computer tower, jewelry box, cufflinks, the victim's wallet, and the keys to a Chevy 2500 pickup truck. The truck was also missing from the residence.

During the investigation, a black backpack containing burglary tools, binoculars, sunglasses, and candy were found in the back pack. Interviews of employees who worked for the victim developed David Stead as a potential suspect. Stead had helped the victim install the wall safe in his residence and Stead had discussed burglarizing and robbing the victim. On July 3, 2016, Stead was arrested at his residence on outstanding traffic warrants. At the time of the arrest, Members of the NJSP Fugitive Unit observed, through a bedroom window, a black and silver semi-automatic handgun, lying on the bedroom floor of the residence.

Witness interviews indicated that the defendant was dropped off near the victim's residence on June 30, 2016. When the defendant was dropped off he had a black backpack and a smart phone and stated that he was going to make money. The victim's pickup truck was subsequently located less than a mile from the defendant's residence. On July 4, 2016, detectives indicated that they wanted to speak to Stead at which time the defendant stated, "I did it."

A Mirandized statement was then taken from Stead. In this statement, Stead told detectives that he shot the victim four times after confronting him at his residence. Stead stated that he went to the victim's house intending to rob him of money and took \$20 and the victim's pickup truck. Stead stated that he discarded the handgun from the vehicle while driving from the scene. He was charged with murder, felony murder, robbery, unlawful possession of a weapon, possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, and theft. On July 9, 2018, the defendant entered a plea to a charge of aggravated manslaughter in exchange for a sentencing recommendation of 30 years 85% to be served without parole. The defendant was sentenced on September 18, 2018, to the recommended 30 years, 85% without parole. This matter was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Michael Angermeier.

STATE V. WILLIAM HINES

On October 29, 2017, Burlington Township Police responded to 211 Britany Court for a reported stabbing. The caller, Nancy Allen reported that her son, William Hines just stabbed her live-in boyfriend, Scott Willis.

Willis sustained multiple stab wounds in the area of his upper chest with one in close proximity to his heart and underwent emergency surgery at Cooper Hospital. Allen told police that she and the victim told her son to get off the couch so that they could clean the apartment. Hines then told his mother that he wanted to kill them both. A short time later the victim went into the bathroom to take a shower and the defendant proceeded to stab him multiple times.

The defendant was cut during the course of this incident. On October 30th, the defendant turned himself in to the police. On November 4, 2017, the victim died from his injuries. The defendant was indicted on murder and weapons charges. The defendant claimed that there was a history of abuse with the victim and that on the day that the victim was killed that the defendant was defending himself. Trial began in this matter on September 18, 2018.

On September 27, 2018, the jury found the defendant guilty of murder and related weapons offenses. At sentencing the defendant, who was extended term eligible, received a life sentence. This matter was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutors Robert Van Gilst and Jensen Vizzard.

PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Public Information Unit was staffed during 2018 by one civilian employee who serves as the Public Information Officer (PIO) and is responsible for daily contacts with the media and general public concerning matters of public record. Working within the guidelines of Executive Order #69, the PIO coordinates with the investigative units and legal staff to release information in compliance with the law.

The PIO maintains contact with regional and local news organizations, including internet, newspaper, radio and television outlets, and works with these organizations to provide information on crimes, arrests, grand jury indictments, court activity, and other information relevant to public safety. The PIO is available to the media 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This system gives the media one source to contact for information, which relieves on-scene investigators and legal personnel from that duty.

The public Information Unit distributes press releases, organizes press conferences and responds daily to inquiries from various media outlets. Copies of all press releases, public statements from the Prosecutor and news clips collected from area media outlets are maintained by the Public Information Officer. Assistance is provided when requested to the county's municipal police departments, as well as state and federal law enforcement agencies during joint operations.

In addition, the PIO assists with requests for public information released under the authority of the Open Public Records Act, provides photography services for Office events, maintains the Office's Facebook and Twitter accounts, provides graphic design support, maintains the Office website and arranges for speakers to attend community and civic events.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The PIO is responsible for coordinating the Office's community outreach efforts, and serves as the agency's Community Outreach Liaison to the New Jersey Office of the Attorney General.

PROCOPS AWARDS BANQUET

The Public Information Officer is responsible for planning and executing the BCPO Annual Awards Banquet, known as PROCOPS (Prosecutor's Recognition Of Citizens Or Public Servants). Established in 1988, the PROCOPS banquet pays tribute to local, state, and federal law enforcement officials along with private citizens and groups working with and providing assistance to law enforcement in Burlington County.

Along with the Prosecutor's awards, the Annual Richard L. Barbour Scholarship Award is presented to a law student selected by the Scholarship Committee. The scholarship was founded in memory of Burlington County Assistant Prosecutor Richard L. Barbour, who

was slain during a robbery in Philadelphia in April 1991. The banquet is held in May during National Police Week and was attended last year by more than 225 people.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

The Special Investigations Unit (SIU) is presently comprised of one detective sergeant and one detective who report directly to a captain. The unit is supervised by an assistant prosecutor.

The SIU conducts investigations into a wide variety of matters including allegations of official misconduct by public officials, political corruption, Sunshine Law violations, Open Public Meetings Act violations and other confidential and/or sensitive matters. SIU investigations may involve local or county law enforcement officers, as well as elected or appointed public officials. The SIU also investigates matters referred to the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office from the Office of the Governor and the Division of Criminal Justice. In addition, the SIU conducts internal affairs investigations of complaints against Prosecutor's Office employees and provides assistance to municipal and county law enforcement agencies conducting their own internal affairs investigations. The SIU is also responsible for providing internal affairs training to local law enforcement agencies as mandated by the New Jersey Attorney General.

The SIU also conducts background investigations on prospective employees of the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office.

In 2018, the Special Investigations Unit was involved in conducting 121 investigations.

TRIAL UNIT

The Trial Unit is responsible for handling the majority of cases following indictment by the Grand Jury. This includes reviewing files upon indictment, negotiating plea agreements, arguing motions, trying cases, handling sentencings and violations of probation and managing Krol cases (involving defendants found not guilty by reason of insanity).

A designated assistant prosecutor supervises the Trial Unit. The unit consists of three trial teams each comprised of two assistant prosecutors. There are also two detectives, three secretaries and several interns. In addition to these permanent members, assistant prosecutors from other sections within the Office serve as adjunct members of the unit and are periodically assigned cases for trial.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED IN 2018

STATE V. JOAQUIN JOHNSON

On December 27, 2017, at approximately 9:30 a.m., the defendant, Joaquin Johnson, knocked on the front door of the residence located at 3 Botany Circle in Willingboro. When the female resident, age 80, cracked the front door, the defendant forced his way into the home. Once inside, he demanded the woman's car keys and purse. When she

failed to comply, he went into the kitchen and grabbed a knife. Once armed, he took her purse, car keys and fled the residence. He then proceeded to enter the victim's vehicle. As he did so, the victim pursued demanding he return her purse. In response, the defendant cut the victim on the arm.

Due to his level of intoxication, he was unable to flee in the vehicle. Police arrived shortly thereafter and detained the defendant. Police then followed a trail of blood back to the home where the victim was found with a blood-soaked towel wrapped around her arm. The victim identified the defendant as the individual who broke into her home and assaulted her.

On December 20, 2018, the defendant pled guilty to first degree armed robbery. He was subsequently sentenced to a term of 12 years in New Jersey state prison. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Kevin Morgan.

STATE V. LONNIE EASTERLING

On June 30, 2017, during the morning rush hour, Lonnie Easterling, while intoxicated, operated his vehicle on Interstate 295. As he did so, he proceeded to strike multiple vehicles, including a vehicle being driven by Linda Valyo, the victim. She was on her way home from the beach with her two small kids when the defendant drove into the side of her car. Fortunately, no injuries were sustained.

New Jersey State Police were dispatched for reports of an erratic driver. When the defendant was located, he failed to stop for approximately five miles. After coming to a halt, a trooper approached the vehicle and found the defendant occupying the driver's seat. The defendant's voice was slurred and his movements were slow, as he explained that he failed to stop simply because he was "looking for a place to pull over." He told the trooper that his new prescription drugs had made him "delirious." The defendant was charged with second degree eluding, along with various motor vehicle offenses.

Defendant did not dispute that he eluded police. Rather, he argued that he suffered from non-self-induced intoxication. In support of his defense, the defendant sought to introduce evidence not through a qualified expert, but through a combination of testimony and documentation regarding his prescription medication. The State was prepared to counter the defense by presenting expert testimony from a drug recognition expert that the cause of defendant's impairment was a combination of illegal narcotics.

On the day of trial, the defendant pled guilty to second-degree eluding. He was subsequently sentenced to a term of six years, three without parole, in New Jersey state prison. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matt Lynch.

STATE V. KYLE SEIDEL

On January 29, 2018, police were dispatched to the Wawa at 2835 Route 206 for reports of an armed robbery. The suspect had robbed the clerk with an airsoft gun, gesturing towards a weapon in his waistband. The suspect stole cash and snack foods from the register area. A description of the vehicle was broadcast via dispatch and the suspect vehicle was pulled over in Mansfield. The vehicle was occupied by the defendant, Kyle Seidel. He was found in possession of the Wawa bag filled with the cash and merchandise. The defendant was indicted for armed robbery.

The defendant pled guilty at arraignment to second-degree robbery. He was sentenced to six years in New Jersey state prison. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Louis Casadia.

STATE V. JOHN RANDOLPH

On September 27, 2016, at approximately 5 a.m., a motor vehicle accident was reported in the area of Hanover Boulevard and Magnolia Street in Pemberton Township. Upon arrival, officers located a 1993 BMW 325i occupied by the defendant, John Randolph, the driver. A second individual, identified as Dennis McCaffrey Jr., occupied the front passenger seat. He was deceased. The vehicle appeared to have spun out of control due to a high rate of speed and made contact with a tree on the opposite side of the road in the woods. The defendant appeared to be in critical condition and was transported to a Trenton hospital.

In an interview, the defendant indicated that prior to the incident, he ingested Adderall pills. He further advised that in addition to the pills, he had also “done some lines.” A toxicology report revealed the presence of marijuana, methamphetamine, and amphetamine (Adderall) in the defendant’s blood. The vehicle was found to have no mechanical defect.

On June 8, 2017, a Burlington County Grand Jury returned an indictment charging the defendant with Vehicular Homicide (Second Degree). On June 19, 2018, the defendant pled guilty and was subsequently sentenced to a term of four years in New Jersey state prison. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Douglas Bligh.

OFFICE OF VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCACY ***(VICTIM WITNESS UNIT)***

The purpose of the Burlington County Office of Victim Witness Advocacy (The Victim Witness Unit) is to ensure that the rights of crime victims and witnesses are protected and that their needs receive full attention. The staff is comprised of one coordinator, five victim advocates, and one secretary, who all serve as liaisons between the victim and the criminal justice system. The advocates work closely with assistant prosecutors and the law enforcement community to help victims understand the vital role they play in the

criminal justice process. We are committed to serving the needs of crime victims and witnesses. Our primary goal is to provide victims with services and support to help them cope with the aftermath of victimization, while trying to make their participation in the criminal justice system less difficult and burdensome.

Our services respond to a diversity of needs, providing answers and explanations about a system that victims and witnesses often find confusing. In 2018, the Victim Witness Unit reached out to more than 5,000 new crime victims, while providing services on more than 30,000 different occasions to each new victim and to victims and witnesses whose cases began prior to 2018.

The range of referrals that our program provides extends to the non-profit sector, law enforcement, and state and federal government. A significant amount of written correspondence is mailed out daily by the Unit secretary and the advocates. In 2018, approximately 50,000 case status letters were mailed out to victims and witnesses of crime. The VINE system, along with assistance from victim advocates, ensured that over 1,300 notifications were mailed to victims advising them about the parole status or release of a violent offender from the New Jersey Department of Corrections or the Burlington County Jail. Advocates frequently escort victims and their families to court, offering support and a caring ear for case status hearings and trials.

The staff is also actively involved with any homicide investigation that occurs within Burlington County. The Victim Witness Unit works closely with the BCPO Major Crimes Unit to provide immediate service to the families of homicide victims. In order to provide these services, an advocate is contacted at the time of the crime and will respond to the local police department or hospital to aid surviving family members. In those circumstances where immediate outreach is problematic, the assigned advocate will contact the family within 24 hours after the homicide. This enables the advocate to start a working relationship with the family while offering services from the Victims of Crime Compensation Office and other agencies.

On a daily basis, the advocates also bear witness to the great strength and perseverance that crime victims and victim survivors display as they navigate through the criminal justice system. In recognition of this journey, our Office annually sponsors two National Crime Victims' Rights Week events. During the week of April 8th - April 14th, 2018 the Victim Witness Unit Staff and others from the BCPO joined our state and the nation in recognizing the struggles and triumphs of the Crime Victims' Rights Movement. The theme for 2018, "Expand the Circle; Reach All Victims" reflected the goals the Victim Witness Unit strives each day to achieve while interacting with crime victims and their families as they are thrust into a system that they never chose to become a part of.

Our well-attended Annual Crime Victims' Rights Week breakfast was held on April 11, 2018 at the Westin Hotel in Mount Laurel. Local politicians, members of the law enforcement community, victims and their families all came together to honor the journey of crime victims. Our speaker, Rich Pompelio, Esquire is a victim advocate and founder of the New Jersey Crime Victims Law Center. He created the center after his son Tony

was murdered, and there were no resources for him and his family and other crime victims as the case moved through the criminal justice system. He was an amazing speaker, and the audience of more than 100 people were inspired and rejuvenated by his sentiments

On Sunday, April 15, 2018 at the Historic Smithville Park and Mansion in Eastampton, we held our Annual Candlelight Vigil. The brief, yet powerful, vigil gives all in attendance the opportunity to light a candle in memory and reverence to the loss of their loved ones and experience fellowship with other concerned individuals. Approximately 75 people attended, and it is a valuable tradition to all of us, and the families we serve.

The mission of the Victim Witness Unit involves serving victims from the very start, until the very end of the court process and beyond; while helping to build their trust in the law enforcement community by our actions, and restoring hope for their future of healing.

The Victim Witness Unit remains dedicated to victims and witnesses of crime. We acknowledge the struggles of crime victims and we strive to continue to help reduce the impact of crime by empowering victims and advocating for their rights. We look forward to continuing to provide these services to victims and the community.

PROSECUTORIAL SCREENING OF DEFENDANTS

SCREENING OUTCOMES	STAGE OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS WHEN DECISION OCCURS	
	PRE-COMPLAINT DECISIONS	POST-COMPLAINT DECISIONS
a. Defendants administratively dismissed	0	552
b. Defendants with charges downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0	2730
c. Defendants accepted for pre-trial diversion	0	62
d. Defendants otherwise screened out	0	131
e. Defendants with change of venue	0	14
f. Accusations filed	0	461
g. Defendants with either indictable complaints authorized or charges approved for grand jury	0	981
H. AOC correction defendants that completed grand jury	0	0
TOTAL SCREENING DECISIONS FOR YEAR (add a - h)	0	4605

DEFENDANT APPLICATIONS FOR DIVERSION PROGRAM, ACTION TAKEN AND OUTCOME

Pre-trial Intervention Diversion Program

	Number of DEFENDANT APPLICATIONS FOR PRE- TRIAL INTERVENTION	
	PRE-INDICTMENT	POST-INDICTMENT
1. Applications reviewed	63	100
2. Recommended for acceptance	63	100
3. Recommended for rejection	6	13
4. Accepted into program	62	105

Section IV. 2.

Section/Unit INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT

County BURLINGTON

completing report

Section IV. 3.a.

Year 2018

**DEFENDANTS PENDING GRAND JURY PROCESS
(Pre-Indictment Defendant Cases)
BY AGE OF COMPLAINT**

AGES OF PRE-INDICTMENT DEFENDANT CASES FROM DATE OF COMPLAINT	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS	
	ACTIVE	INACTIVE/FUGITIVE
1. 0 to 1 month	153	0
2. 1+ to 2 months	168	5
3. 2+ TO 3 Months	125	6
4. 3+ to 4 months	92	20
5. Over 4 months	349	63
6. TOTAL defendant cases pending grand jury	897	94

Rev. 1995

DEFENDANTS COMPLETING THE GRAND JURY PROCESS AND ACTION TAKEN

ACTION TAKEN	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants presented to the grand jury	1421
2. Defendants indicted	1413
3. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
4. Defendants no billed/no action	8
5. TOTAL defendants completing the grand jury process	1421

DEFENDANTS CHARGED BY ACCUSATION

	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
TOTAL Defendants charged through Accusation	461

DEFENDANTS PENDING DISPOSITION OF CHARGES BY AGE OF INDICTMENT OR ACCUSATION

AGES OF POST-INDICTMENT DEFENDANT CASES FROM DATE OF INDICTMENT OF ACCUSATION	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS	
	ACTIVE	INACTIVE/FUGITIVE
1. 0 to 3 months	206	101
2. 3+ to 6 months	80	73
3. 6+ to 9 months	49	63
4. 9+ to 12 months	11	39
5. 12+ to 24 months	17	93
6. 24+ months	24	441
7. TOTAL post-indictment/accusation defendant cases pending	387	810

DEFENDANTS WITH INDICTMENTS/ACCUSATIONS DISPOSED BY OFFENSE CATEGORY AND MANNER OF DISPOSITION

MANNER OF DISPOSITION	OFFENSE CATEGORIES										
	Homicide	Kidnap- ping	Sexual Assault	Robbery	Arson	Assault	Burglary	Bribery	Narcotics	Official Miscon- duct	Perjury/ Falsifi- cation
1. Guilty plea to most serious offense	11	14	10	30	29	118	113	1	310	1	11
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	6	9	5	26	2	10	6	1	16	0	1
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	0	16	0	2
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense											
a. Jury	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Guilty at trial, lesser indictable offense											
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
6. Guilty at trial, dis. persons offense											
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Not guilty at trial											
a. Jury	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
8. Acceptance into diversion program	0	3	0	0	5	7	4	0	28	0	2
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	0	1	1	5	10	10	4	1	38	0	1
11. TOTAL dispositions	28	28	16	63	46	159	128	3	409	1	17

DEFENDANTS WITH INDICTMENTS/ACCUSATIONS DISPOSED BY OFFENSE CATEGORY AND MANNER OF DISPOSITION

MANNER OF DISPOSITION										
	Theft	Forgery/ Fraud	Weapons	Child Abuse/ Endanger	Gambling	Wiretap	Obstr. Gov't Oper.	Fail to Register	Other	TOTAL
1. Guilty plea to most serious offense	236	48	62	23	0	0	55	15	61	1148
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	12	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	3	107
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	10	2	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	52
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense										
a. Jury	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	13
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Guilty at trial, lesser indictable offense										
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Guilty at trial, dis. persons offense										
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Not guilty at trial										
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
8. Acceptance into diversion program	32	18	4	2	0	0	6	0	2	113
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	29	7	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	139
11. TOTAL dispositions	319	75	78	29	0	0	70	15	72	1556

POST-CONVICTION ACTIVITIES AND MISCELLANEOUS COURT ACTIVITIES BY TYPE AND OUTCOME

POST CONVICTION ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME	NUMBER
1. Krol hearings involving the prosecutor's office	38
2. TOTAL post-conviction relief applications filed involving the prosecutor's office	26
a. Defendants granted relief	1
b. Defendants denied relief	22
3. TOTAL habeas corpus petitions filed involving the prosecutor's office	1
a. Defendants granted relief	0
b. Defendants denied relief	2

CAREER CRIMINAL WORKLOAD AND GRAND JURY ACTION

CAREER CRIMINAL WORKLOAD AND GRAND JURY ACTION	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants reviewed for acceptance into career criminal prosecution program	1
2. Defendants accepted for prosecution as career criminals	1
3. TOTAL career criminal defendants completing grand jury process	1
a. Defendants indicted	1
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0
4. TOTAL career criminal defendants charged through accusation	0

**CAREER CRIMINAL
DEFENDANTS PENDING GRAND JURY PROCESS
(Pre-Indictment Defendant Cases)
BY AGE OF COMPLAINT**

AGES OF PRE-INDICTMENT DEFENDANT CASES FROM DATE OF COMPLAINT	NUMBER
1. 0 to 1 month	0
2. 1+ to 2 months	0
3. 2+ to 3 months	0
4. 3+ to 4 months	0
5. Over 4 months	0
6. TOTAL defendant cases pending grand jury	0

**CAREER CRIMINAL
DEFENDANTS PENDING DISPOSITION OF CHARGES
BY AGE OF INDICTMENT OR ACCUSATION**

AGES OF POST-INDICTMENT DEFENDANT CASES FROM DATE OF INDICTMENT OR ACCUSATION	NUMBER
1. 0 to 3 months	0
2. 3+ to 6 months	0
3. 6+ to 9 months	0
4. 9+ to 12 months	0
5. 12+ to 24 months	0
6. 24+ months	0
7. TOTAL post-indictment/accusation defendant cases pending	0

**CAREER CRIMINAL
 DEFENDANTS WITH INDICTMENTS/ACCUSATION DISPOSED
 BY MANNER OF DISPOSITION**

MANNER OF DISPOSITION	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Guilty plea to most serious offense	1
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	0
3. Ind. disp., plea to disorderly persons offense	0
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense	0
a. Jury trial	0
b. Non-jury trial	0
5. Guilty at trial, lesser indictable offense	0
a. Jury trial	0
b. Non-jury trial	0
6. Guilty at trial, disorderly persons offense	0
a. Jury trial	0
b. Non-jury trial	0
7. Not guilty at trial	0
a. Jury trial	0
b. Non-jury trial	0
8. Acceptance into diversion program	0
9. Dismissed over objection of prosecutor	0
10. Dismissed on motion of prosecutor	0
11. TOTAL dispositions	1

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	40	0	0	17	5	62	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	82	1	2	339	15	437	1
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	122	1	0	356	20	499	1
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	95	1	0	307	15	418	1
a. Resulting in criminal charges	1	0	0	4	1	6	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	1	0	1	
d. Closed - No further action	94	1	0	302	14	411	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	27	0	0	49	5	81	0

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	8
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	1
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	6
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	5
a. Defendants indicted	5
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS		NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE-Original and Post-complaint Investigations						
		Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
		Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1.	Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	6	0	0	2	18	26	0
2.	Investigations opened during the year	27	2	1	7	23	60	0
3.	TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1-2)	33	2	1	9	41	86	0
4.	TOTAL Investigations completed during this year	18	0	1	4	12	35	0
a.	Resulting in criminal charges	1	0	0	2	2	5	0
b.	Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	7	0	0	1	1	9	0
c.	Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Closed - No further action	10	0	1	1	9	21	0
5.	Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	15	2	0	5	29	51	0

Rev. 1995

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	5
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	1
c. Defendants with complaints referred to family court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	2
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	1
4. Defendants completing the grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation	5
a. Defendants indicted	5
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendant no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS		NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE-Original and Post-complaint Investigations						
		Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
		Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1.	Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	2	0	0	2	0	4	0
2.	Investigations opened during the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1-2)	2	0	0	2	0	4	0
4.	TOTAL Investigations completed during this year	2	0	0	1	0	3	0
a.	Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Closed - No further action	2	0	0	1	0	3	0
5.	Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	0	0	1	0	1	0

Rev. 1995

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	0
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to family court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	0
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing the grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendant no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS		NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE-Original and Post-complaint Investigations						
		Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
		Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1.	Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	1	0	0	1	1	3	0
2.	Investigations opened during the year	17	0	0	6	0	23	0
3.	TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1-2)	18	0	0	7	1	26	0
4.	TOTAL Investigations completed during this year	7	0	0	0	1	8	0
a.	Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
d.	Closed - No further action	6	0	0	0	1	7	0
5.	Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	11	0	0	7	0	18	0

Rev. 1995

**DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN
CRIMINAL CHARGES**

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	0
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to family court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	0
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing the grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendant no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS		NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE-Original and Post-complaint Investigations						
		Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
		Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1.	Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Investigations opened during the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1-2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	TOTAL Investigations completed during this year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a.	Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.	Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d.	Closed - No further action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.	Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Rev. 1995

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	0
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to family court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	0
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing the grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendant no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	0	7	0	0	2	9	4
2. Investigations opened during the year	0	7	0	0	20	27	17
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	0	14	0	0	22	36	21
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	0	13	0	0	17	30	18
a. Resulting in criminal charges	0	3	0	0	13	16	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	0	10	0	0	4	14	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	1	0	0	5	6	3

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	16
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	14
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	2
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	16
a. Defendants indicted	16
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

Due to bail reform requirements, complaints simultaneously signed following direct presentment

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	21	0	2	8	26	56	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	54	7	3	104	82	250	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	76	7	3	112	108	306	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	60	6	2	76	84	228	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	3	0	0	4	1	8	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	7	2	0	18	8	35	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	1	1	2	
d. Closed - No further action	50	4	2	53	74	183	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	16	1	1	36	24	78	0

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	5
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	3
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	2
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	3
a. Defendants indicted	3
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	20	1	0	4	6	31	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	12	0	0	2	5	19	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	32	1	0	6	12	50	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	6	0	0	2	14	22	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	1	0	0	2	4	7	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	5	0	0	0	10	15	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	17	0	0	1	6	24	0

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	6
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	2
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	2
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	2
3. Defendants charged through accusation	2
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	4
a. Defendants indicted	2
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

Appellate Division and Other Appellate Courts

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS/OUTCOMES	Appellate Division Appeals						NJ Supreme Court Appeals	U.S. and Other Court Appeals (specify court)	TOTAL
	Criminal referral cases	Other criminal appeals	Criminal Inter-locutory	Juvenile	Law Division (de novo)	Civil			
1. Appeals pending at beginning of the year	49	1	0	1	1	0	0	5	57
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	35	10	0	1	4	0	0	1	51
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	3	0	0	0	14	0	17
4. Appellate briefs filed	30	10	0	1	5	0	0	2	48
5. STATE Appeals and - TOTAL DISPOSED Cross Appeals	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
b. Conviction or order reversed	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
c. Remanded or judgment modified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. DEFENSE Appeals - TOTAL DISPOSED	38	9	1	1	4	0	0	2	56
a. Conviction or order affirmed	33	7	1	1	3	0	0	2	47
b. Conviction or order reversed	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
c. Remanded or judgment modified	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7. Appeals pending at the end of the year	46	2	0	1	1	0	0	4	57

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS Law Division

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS/OUTCOMES	MUNICIPAL COURT APPEALS -- BY TYPE OF VIOLATION					TOTAL
	Criminal	Disorderly Persons	Motor Vehicle	Municipal Ordinances	Other	
1. Appeals pending at beginning of year	0	3	6	0	0	9
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	0	4	23	0	0	27
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	3	0	0	3
4. Appellate briefs filed	0	6	27	0	0	33
5. TOTAL APPEALS DISPOSED	0	6	25	0	0	46
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	6	35	0	0	31
b. Conviction or order reversed	0	1	2	0	0	3
c. Remanded or judgment modified	0	0	2	0	0	2
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Appeals pending at the end of the year	0	1	4	0	0	5

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY INTAKE

Filings	Number of Juveniles	Number of Cases	Number of Offenses
1. TOTAL New Juvenile Delinquency Filings During the Year	656	919	1531
a. Diverted		380	513
b. Juvenile Referee		41	86
c. Informal Calendar (Counsel Not Mandatory)		46	80
d. Formal Calendar (Counsel Mandatory)		392	780
2. Delinquency Filings Dismissed, Consolidated or Withdrawn During the Year		12	15
3. TOTAL Violations of Probation Filed During the Year		36	41
a. Informal Calendar (Counsel Not Mandatory)		0	0
b. Formal Calendar (Counsel Mandatory)		30	30

Form Cont'd, next page

Section IV. 9. a. Juvenile Delinquency Intake (continued)

1. County Screening Procedures – check the box that most accurately describes your procedures. Do not check more than one box.	
a. Prosecutor's office reviews all new delinquency complaints either before or after diversion.	N/A
b. Prosecutor's office reviews selected delinquency complaints either before or after diversion based on offense charged or other criteria.	X
c. Prosecutor's office does not screen new delinquency complaints.	X
2. Violations of Probation – check the box that most accurately describes your procedures. Do not check more than one box.	
a. An Assistant Prosecutor appears at all V.O.P. hearings.	N/A
b. An Assistant Prosecutor appears at selected V.O.P. hearings based on offense charged or other criteria.	X
c. Assistant Prosecutors do not appear at V.O.P. hearings.	N/A

Rev. 1999

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DISPOSED CASES

Disposed Cases	Number of Juveniles	Number of Cases
1. Total Juvenile Disposed Cases	337	479
a. Adjudicated Delinquent		298
b. Adjudicated Not Delinquent		0

Trials	
2. Total Number of Trials – Assistant Prosecutor Appearing	4
a. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent on One or More Charges at Trial.	4
b. Juveniles Adjudicated Not Delinquent at Trial.	0

JUVENILE WAIVER DECISIONS

1. Voluntary Waivers at Juvenile's Request	4
2. Juvenile Waiver Applications by Prosecutor	
a. Pending at Beginning of Year	0
b. Motions Filed by Prosecutor this Year	4
3. Juvenile Waiver Decisions (Prosecutor's Applications)	
a. Waived on Prosecutor's Motion with Juvenile's Consent	4
b. Waived on Prosecutor's Motion after a Hearing	0
c. Motion Voluntarily Withdrawn by Prosecutor	0
d. Waivers Denied	0
e. Total Decisions (sum of 3a through 3d)	4
4. Juvenile Waiver Applications filed by Prosecutor Pending at Year End (2.a. + 2.b. - 3.e.)	0

JUVENILE HABITUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM WORKLOAD AND ADJUDICATIONS

WORKLOAD AND ADJUDICATIONS	NUMBER OF JUVENILES
1. Juveniles reviewed for acceptance into habitual offender program	N/A
2. Juveniles accepted for prosecution as habitual offenders	N/A
3. TOTAL juvenile adjudications	N/A
a. Adjudicated delinquent by admission, i.e., guilty plea	N/A
b. Adjudicated delinquent at hearing	N/A
c. Adjudicated not delinquent	N/A
d. Complaint dismissed or withdrawn	N/A
e. Adjudication adjourned, continuance granted	N/A

VICTIM/WITNESS NOTIFICATION SERVICES

NOTIFICATION SERVICES	NOTIFICATION PROVIDED TO					
	VICTIMS		Lay WITNESSES		Law Enforcement WITNESSES	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Initial contact	X			X		X
Administrative dismissal	X			X	X	
Remand to municipal court	X			X	X	
Indictment returned	X		X		X	
No bill	X		X		X	
Acceptance into pre-trial intervention	X			X	X	
Guilty plea	X		X		X	
Not guilty at trial	X		X		X	
Guilty at trial	X		X		X	
Indictment dismissed	X			X	X	
Sentence	X		X		X	
Parole	X			X	X	
Disposition of juvenile cases	X			X		X
Other (specify) Written VINE notifications are sent to victims informing them about a defendant's release from the county jail.	X		X		X	
Other (specify) Dept. of Corrections inmate notifications re: sentence served release dates & community release / half-way acceptance notices	X			X		X

VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE
 SERVICES PROVIDED

VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE SERVICES	SERVICE PROVIDED TO			
	VICTIMS		WITNESSES	
	Juvenile Cases	Adult Cases	Juvenile Cases	Adult Cases
INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICES				
Introductory brochure	X	X		
Criminal Justice system orientation	X	X	X	X
Case information	X	X	X	X
VCCO referral	X	X	X	X
Social service information/referral	X	X	X	X
Crime prevention information/referral	X	X	X	X
Property return information	X	X	X	X
Witness fee information	X	X	X	X
Public education, community awareness	X	X	X	X
LOGISTIC SERVICES				
Stand-by subpoena and call	X	X	X	X
Witness waiting area	X	X	X	X
Response to witness intimidation, harassment	X	X	X	X
Restitution recommendation at sentencing	X	X		
VCCO claim assistance	X	X	X	X
Social service intervention	X	X	X	X
Employer/student intervention	X	X	X	X
Travel, lodging assistance	X	X	X	X
Transportation assistance	X	X	X	X
Child care assistance	X	X	X	X
Property return assistance	X	X	X	X
Witness fee assistance	X	X	X	X
Victim impact statement assistance	X	X		
Counseling	X	X	X	X
Other (specify) (48-hr outreach in Homicide Cases)	X	X		
Other (specify) HIV testing	X	X		
Other (specify) Nicole's Law Restraining Order	X	X		
Other (specify) Court Accompaniment	X	X	X	X

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	NUMBER	VALUE
1. Notice of intention to solicit funds received	N/A	
2. Expungement applications received	505	
3. TOTAL number of forfeiture actions	*164	
4. Number of motor vehicles obtained through forfeiture actions	6 cars	
5. TOTAL value of property forfeited		\$ 387,342.96
a. Cash forfeited		\$ 373,273.96
b. Value of forfeited motor vehicles (Estimated Value)		\$ 12,001.00**
c. Value of other forfeited property (Estimated Value)		\$ 2,068.00***
(Specify property)		
One iPad, three televisions		
* Total of 203 cases screened; 164 forfeitures filed; 39 forfeitures declined ** Actual value received by auction for 1 car - \$2,651.00 Estimated Value of 5 cars forfeited and turned over to police departments - \$9,350.00 *** Actual value received by auction for 13 items - \$20,550.38 Estimated value of 1 item forfeited and turned over to police departments - \$1,300.00		

ADULT DEFENDANTS WITH BIAS CRIME RELATED CHARGES DISPOSED

	TOTAL	NUMBER CONVICTED		ACQUITTED	DISMISSED	DOWNGRADE/ REMAND
		PLEA	TRIAL			
Number of bias crime incidents reported to BCPO in 2018	53					
Number of defendants indicted or disposed at the Superior Court level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom application for extended term of imprisonment made	0					
Number of defendants for whom application was granted	0					
Number of defendants for whom application was denied	0					
Number of defendants for whom simple assault was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom harassment was upgraded to 4th degree crime	3	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants who had both an upgrade to a 4th degree crime and an application for extended terms	0					

JUVENILE DEFENDANTS WITH BIAS CRIME RELATED CHARGES DISPOSED

	TOTAL	NUMBER CONVICTED		ACQUITTED	DISMISSED	DOWNGRADE/ REMAND
		PLEA	TRIAL			
Number of bias crime incidents reported to BCPO in 2018 – believed to be juvenile	12					
Number of juveniles disposed	0					
Number of juveniles waived for adult prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles for whom application for extended term of imprisonment made	0					
Number of juveniles for whom application was granted	0					
Number of juveniles for whom application was denied	0					
Number of juveniles for whom simple assault was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles for whom harassment was upgraded to 4th degree crime	1	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles who had both an upgrade to a 4th degree crime and an application for extended terms	0					

POLICE PURSUIT SUMMARY REPORT

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office COUNTY TOTALS	County: Burlington
Reporting Period 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2018	
Person completing report: DSG. Stephen Craig	Date completed: 02/25/19
Phone number: (609) 265-5878	

1. Number of pursuits initiated	40
2. Number of pursuits resulting in accidents	8
3. Number of pursuits resulting in injuries (NO DEATHS)	3
4. Number of pursuits resulting in death	0
5. Number of pursuits resulting in arrest	20
6. Number of vehicles in accidents	
a. Pursued vehicles	8
b. Police vehicles	3
c. Third party vehicles	3
7. Number of people injured	
a. Pursued vehicles	1
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	2
d. Pedestrians	0
8. Number of people killed	
a. Pursued vehicles	0
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	0
d. Pedestrians	0
9. Number of people arrested	26
10. Number of pursuits in which a tire deflation device was used	0

Section IV. 14.a.

POLICE PURSUIT SUMMARY REPORT

The police chief or designee in each of your county's police departments should prepare a Police Pursuit Summary Report. This PPSR is an aggregation of the data obtained from the Police Pursuit Incident Report. The Summary Report is to be submitted to the Prosecutor's Office. The Prosecutor's Office is required to aggregate and submit the county totals on the attached form. The Annual Report form is identical law enforcement agencies.

USE OF FORCE SUMMARY REPORT
Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Totals

Person Completing Report: DSG. Stephen Craig	Date Completed: 02/26/19
Reporting Period: 01/01/2018-12/31/2018	Telephone Number: (609) 265-5035

1.	Number of incidents reported	374
	a. Number of reports completed	695
2.	Number of Officers involved	688
3.	Number of incidents resulting in injury TOTAL	68
	a. Officer	33
	b. Subject	35
4.	Number of incidents resulting in death TOTAL	0
	a. Officer	0
	b. Subject	0
5.	Number of incidents resulting in arrest	278
6.	Type of incident	
	a. Crime in progress	78
	b. Domestic	57
	c. Suspicious person	22
	d. Traffic Violation	44
	e. Other Dispute	27
	f. Other	60
7.	Level of subject resistance	
	a. Resisted Officer control	332
	b. Physical threat / Attack on Officer	73
	c. Threatened / Attacked Officer w/blunt object	3
	d. Threatened / Attacked Officer w/knife or cutting object	5
	e. Threatened / Attacked Officer w/motor vehicle	0
	f. Threatened / Attacked Officer w/firearm	0
	g. Fired at Officer	0
	h. Other	44
8.	Type of force used	
	a. Compliance hold / Wrestle to ground	362
	b. Hands / Fist	41
	c. Kicks / Feet	19
	d. Strike / Use baton or other object	5
	e. Chemical / Natural agent	8
	f. Canine agent	1
	g. Firearms discharge	0
	h. Number of shots fired	0
	i. Number of hits	0
	j. Other	85
9.	Number of persons arrested during use of force incidents TOTAL	274

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORM

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office TOTALS

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2018

TABLE 1 -- COMPLAINTS FILED

Type of Complaint	Anonymous Complaints	Citizen Complaints	Agency Complaints	Total Complaints
Excessive Force	0	7	1	8
Improper Arrest	0	5	1	6
Improper Entry	0	1	0	1
Improper Search	0	3	3	6
Other Criminal Violation	0	5	1	6
Differential Treatment	0	37	5	42
Demeanor	2	73	4	79
Domestic Violence	0	1	2	3
Other Rule Violation	0	71	207	278
TOTAL	2	203	224	429

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORM

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office TOTALS

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2018

TABLE 2 -- AGENCY DISPOSITIONS

	Sustained	Exonerated	Not Sustained	Unfounded	Administratively Closed	Total Dispositions
Excessive Force	0	5	1	0	0	6
Improper Arrest	0	3	1	2	0	6
Improper Entry	0	0	1	0	0	1
Improper Search	1	8	0	0	0	9
Other Criminal Violation	1	1	2	2	0	6
Differential Treatment	0	31	8	3	0	42
Demeanor	12	29	17	20	1	79
Domestic Violence	0	1	1	1	0	3
Other Rule Violation	155	38	16	43	26	278
TOTAL	169	116	47	71	27	430

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORM

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office TOTALS

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2018

TABLE 3 -- COURT DISPOSITIONS

Court	Cases Dismissed	Cases Diverted	Acquittals	Convictions
Municipal Court	1	0	0	1
Superior Court	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	0	0	1

BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES

ACTIVITY	YEAR	Total Operating Budget (excluding Grants)	Total Grants Funding
1. TOTAL actual expenditures, prior report year (include all County, State and Federal funding)	2017	8,773,330	791,541
a. Salaries and Wages		8,527,069	447,086
b. Other Expenses		246,261	117,434
2. TOTAL Budgeted Appropriations, current report year (include all County, State and Federal funding)	2018	9,309,635	785,055
a. Salaries and Wages		9,011,035	537,673
b. Other Expenses		298,600	247,382