

ANNUAL REPORT



2020

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	9
CIVIL REMEDIES UNIT	9
CRIME SCENE UNIT	12
EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT	13
FAMILY UNIT.....	14
FINANCIAL CRIMES UNIT	16
GANG, GUN AND NARCOTICS TASK FORCE.....	17
GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT	21
HIGH-TECH CRIMES/FORENSIC UNIT	24
HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT	28
INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT	28
INSURANCE FRAUD UNIT	29
INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT	30
MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – VIOLENT OFFENDERS SECTION.....	32
MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – SPECIAL VICTIMS SECTION	35
PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT	39
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	40
TRIAL UNIT	40
OFFICE OF VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCACY	45
STATISTICAL DATA.....	47

PROSECUTOR'S MESSAGE

Welcome to the 2020 Annual Report of the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office. For all of us, 2020 was a year like no other. The COVID-19 pandemic brought court proceedings, including grand jury sessions and criminal trials, to a sudden halt in mid-March, delaying the disposition of criminal matters.

Nevertheless, the BCPO remained firmly committed to our mission to advance the cause of justice, protect public safety, support crime victims, support our local law enforcement partners, and remain engaged with the communities we proudly serve. Recognizing our critical role in public safety, we provided our staff with the resources to work effectively from home, while at the same time taking the necessary precautions to ensure the safety of our employees who continued to report to work so we could respond as needed to crime scenes and other serious incidents.

I am incredibly proud of our employees who persevered through the worst of the pandemic, enabling us to never sacrifice our operational effectiveness. Crime victims got their calls returned; homicides got solved; fatal overdoses were investigated and charged as drug-induced-death crimes when the evidence supported those charges.

Although the courts being closed for trials and grand jury presentations presented significant obstacles for cases to progress, our Assistant Prosecutors, detectives and support staff worked diligently to investigate and prepare cases as far as the COVID restrictions would allow, which facilitated fair resolutions in hundreds of cases.

The lockdowns necessitated by the pandemic meant more screentime for students (sometimes unsupervised when their parents had to work) – and for online child predators. Sex offenders took full advantage of the opportunity to connect with and exploit children online, and referrals from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to our Office increased substantially over 2019. Seeing this obvious need, the BCPO's High-Tech Crime Unit conducted Operation Safe Quarantine, targeting those who sought to meet up with children for sexual activity, or who trafficked Child Sexual Abuse Material online. This Operation led to the arrest of 46 individuals engaged in online child exploitation between May 2020 and May 2021.

The killing of George Floyd by a Minneapolis police officer in May 2020 brought to the forefront longstanding issues of social justice and forced the law enforcement community to confront difficult questions about how much progress we have made towards equal justice for all. I was pleased to participate in a number of events with law enforcement officers and police chiefs and members of the public, where we were able to hear the concerns of the communities we serve directly. Although we receive few complaints of police misconduct, it is clear that there are members of our communities who do not trust law enforcement, or believe that they are treated fairly in the criminal justice system. Some parents even expressed fear for their children's safety if they should encounter the police. This feeling is heartbreaking, as no one should ever have to worry for their safety or the safety of a loved one when dealing with the police. The vast majority of police

officers come to work at their dangerous job with nothing other than a desire to protect and serve everyone in their communities, equally and fairly, yet this perception by some members of the public persists. As part of an ongoing effort to address this concern, we mandated that all police officers in Burlington County complete implicit bias training by early 2021, and this training was in fact completed by all departments by February 2021.

The work of building trust with the communities we serve can never end. We are committed to working with residents of every background to hear their ideas, address their concerns, provide accountability and transparency for the conduct of law enforcement officers, and constantly strive to ensure equal justice for all.

Finally, it is well known that the coronavirus pandemic was especially difficult for those people struggling with substance use disorder. The United States lost a staggering 93,000 people to fatal overdoses in 2020, up nearly 30% from 2019. In Burlington County, however, we saw signs of hope, with a 16% decrease in fatal overdoses in 2020 over 2019, the first decrease in fatal overdoses in more than a decade. We believe that this decline is related in part to our unwavering commitment to keep operating – and even expand – our Straight ... to Treatment and Operation Helping Hand programs. Even though municipal buildings were closed, police stations, of course, remained open and we continued to connect people seeking help with treatment programs in our existing Straight ... to Treatment sites in Evesham, Burlington City and Pemberton, and opened a fourth location, at the Mount Holly Township Police Department, in October. Additionally, recognizing the enhanced need for services during the pandemic, we were able to maintain our 24/7 Operation Helping Hand program continuously from May 2020 through the end of the year. Anytime a police officer in Burlington County reversed someone from an overdose who was arrested for a non-violent offense, or simply known by the officer to be struggling with SUD wanted help, a peer recovery specialist was available to be summoned by that police officer to provide help right away. Through OHH, 112 people accepted recovery coaching and 59 people were referred to treatment. We are proud that these programs will remain operational without interruption through 2021.

Please review this annual report for other information and highlights of the work that the outstanding men and women of the BCPO did in 2020 to advance the cause of justice, enhance public safety and support victims of crime. In 2020, we also launched our re-designed web-site, and we invite the public to check in regularly with www.burlpros.org, as well as with our Facebook page, <https://www.facebook.com/burlpros>, for information and updates on cases, community outreach activities, public safety and criminal justice. We always welcome your feedback on how we can communicate better with the public.



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 2020 U.S. Census population count for Burlington County is 461,860.

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 Commissioners (formerly known as the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders) and during 2020 employed 121 people.

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.

One of the unit's attorneys is responsible for providing legal support to Burlington County's police departments regarding animal cruelty matters. The assistant prosecutor advises the departments about charging decisions, assists with the preparation and signing of arrest warrants and search

warrants where appropriate, and answers other legal questions posed by citizen and law enforcement reports of cruelty to animals. The assistant prosecutor also act as a liaison between the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office and the Office of the New Jersey Attorney General regarding animal cruelty matters in Burlington County.

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. 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 2020, the CAR Unit investigated 120 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 18 cases.

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 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 proceedings. The Unit also handles miscellaneous civil litigation involving the BCPO, advises and educates local police departments regarding forfeitures and is responsible for responding to Open Public Records Requests received by the BCPO.

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 and Major Crimes, and from municipal, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies. By participation with federal agencies, the BCPO has received shares of federally forfeited funds.

In 2020, state and federal civil forfeiture generated \$195,330.67 in cash and property for law enforcement use. Of civil judgments and auction totals, \$82,311.80 was distributed to participating state and local law enforcement agencies and some \$67,203.18 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 2020, \$15,745.69 in Ten Percent Funds was distributed to participating departments.

Property forfeited includes cash, cars and miscellaneous items such as computers and iPads. 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 2020 included cash, cars and miscellaneous items. Seven vehicles were turned over to local police departments for law enforcement use. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office was unable to conduct any public auction of forfeited property.

The Civil Remedies Unit relies on the Screening and Intake, Juvenile and Evidence Management Units of the BCPO 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 2020, 100 cases were reviewed for forfeiture and some 62 pending matters were resolved or partially resolved.

The Evidence Management Unit assists 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 BCPO office manager monitors the accounts, files quarterly reports and reconciles forfeiture reporting by the local police departments pursuant to Attorney General's Office regulations.

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

2020 CONTRIBUTIVE SHARES
DISRIBUTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

ATTORNEY GENERAL	\$20,005.47
BORDENTOWN CITY	\$1,086.00
BORDENTOWN TWP	\$4,705.47
BURLINGTON CITY	\$11,286.34
BURLINGTON TWP	\$1,557.20
CINNAMINSON TWP	\$3,681.90
DELANCO TWP	\$188.00
EASTAMPTON TWP	\$376.20
EVESHAM TWP	\$6,354.69
FEDERAL JUSTICE	\$1,889.77
FLORENCE TWP	\$581.33
LUMBERTON TWP	\$130.00
MAPLE SHADE TWP	\$2,472.67
MEDFORD TWP	\$161.00
MOUNT HOLLY TWP	\$1,640.00
MOUNT LAUREL TWP	\$819.00
PALMYRA BOROUGH	\$525.33
PEMBERTON TWP	\$13,100.66
RIVERSIDE TWP	\$3,764.67
RIVERTON BOROUGH	\$1,084.67
BURLINGTON CO. SHERIFF	\$263.60
WESTAMPTON TWP	\$1,266.00
WILLINGBORO TWP	\$5,371.83
GRAND TOTAL	\$82,311.80

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 they 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 cases handled by the BCPO, these detectives also provide assistance to the other units of the Prosecutor's Office, such as the SACA Unit, CAR Unit, GGNTF, 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.

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.

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, 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 insure that 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 DURING 2020

STATE V. AKIL HERBERT

On September 7, 2016, at approximately 4 p.m., officers from the Florence Township Police Department were dispatched to the area of Fifth Avenue for a female that was stabbed. Police were advised that the male suspect had fled the scene and was possibly still armed. When officers arrived on scene, they observed a female lying on the ground, face down. Bystanders were applying pressure to her back with towels, and there were also lacerations to the victim's face. Officers were able to identify the victim as Desiree Youmans.

It was determined that Ms. Youmans had multiple stab wounds to the back, as well as several lacerations to her face. Ms. Youmans was eventually taken to a Trenton hospital.

Witness who remained on scene told police that the male subject, who they identified as Akil Herbert, had taken off on foot towards the woods after stabbing Ms. Youmans. Specifically, witnesses said that Ms. Youmans left her mother's residence at 254 Fifth Street and began walking to her vehicle. As she was walking, the defendant left his residence at 258 Fifth Street and began to attack Ms. Youmans. Once Ms. Youmans fell to the ground, the defendant picked up the victim's head and began to slam it to the ground. Witnesses were not aware that he was attacking her with a knife until after the incident was over and they saw the wounds on her back.

Police ultimately set up a perimeter in the area. The search included a New Jersey State Police Helicopter, countless police officers, and a K9 officer. The defendant was unable to be located that day. The next morning, at 6:26 a.m., the defendant's mother, Tawana Herbert, called the police and said her son was back in the residence. Akil Herbert was ultimately located hiding in the basement under clothing. When he was taken into custody, he was brought to Lourdes Hospital for treatment of the wounds he sustained during the attack. While he was in the hospital, he repeatedly asked the officers if Desiree was alive and what kind of charges he might receive.

When police spoke with the victim after the attack, she said that she left her mother's house that day because she felt like Akil and his mother were watching her and she did not feel comfortable in the house alone. As she left the residence, Akil came out and began attacking her. Desiree did not immediately realize she was being stabbed, she thought he was punching her and she started screaming. The defendant was charged with Attempted Murder (First Degree), Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose (Third Degree), Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Fourth Degree), and Contempt of a Domestic Violence of a Restraining Order (Fourth Degree).

On September 22, 2020, the defendant pled guilty to Attempted Murder (First Degree) and Contempt of a Domestic Violence Restraining Order (Fourth Degree). On November 5, 2020, defendant was sentenced to twelve years in New Jersey state prison.

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.

The unit, which is comprised of an Assistant Prosecutor, a Detective and a Prosecutor's Agent, 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 is worked exclusively or jointly with another agency. In most instances, Financial Crimes Unit cases involve a multitude of victims, significant amounts of money (generally \$75,000 or more), 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. 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)
- 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. In 2020, the Unit was staffed with two sergeants, six detectives, and three Task Force Officers (TFO's) from the Mount Laurel Township Police Department, the Mount Holly Township Police Department, and the Burlington City Police Department. Command of the Unit was led by a lieutenant, a captain, and the Assistant Prosecutor Unit Supervisor.

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

In 2020, the Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF) remained committed to its mission of reducing the presence of Controlled Dangerous Substances and firearms in Burlington County communities. Despite having operations adversely affected by the COVID-19 Global Pandemic, the Unit persevered and initiated seventy-four (74) investigations that led to the arrests of eighty-three (83) persons and the seizure of approximately two (2) pounds of Methamphetamine, twenty-seven (27) pounds of Marijuana, three (3) ounces of Heroin and/or Fentanyl, ten (10) ounces of Cocaine, one (1) kilogram of Dimethyltryptamine (DMT), one (1) ounce of Psilocybin, forty (40) firearms, six (6) explosives, five (5) vehicles, and \$89,000 in US currency.

Similar to previous years, the Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF) focused its investigative efforts on combatting the Opioid epidemic. As stated previously, GGNTF seized approximately three (3) ounces of Heroin/Fentanyl in 2020. In addition, GGNTF prioritized the pursuit of Drug Induced Death investigations and Strict Liability prosecutions. GGNTF screened 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. Our concentrated focus on Drug Induced Death investigations resulted in increased prosecutions for CDS Distribution and Strict Liability. In 2020, the GGNTF was recognized by the New Jersey Narcotics Enforcement Officers Association (NJNEOA) for Unit Excellence for recording seventeen (17) strict liability arrests between 2015 and 2019. GGNTF remained steadfast to its involvement in Drug Induced Death investigations with eight (8) Strict Liability arrests in 2020.

The devastation caused by the Opioid epidemic cannot be understated. Beginning in 2014, Burlington County experienced the initial wave of the Opioid epidemic that crippled much of the United States over the past six (6) years. The consumption of Opioids had resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of Burlington County overdose fatalities. According to NJ CARES statistics, from 2015 through 2020, Burlington County lost 793 people from drug overdoses. Broken down by year, the deaths are reflected as 87 in 2015; 96 in 2016; 149 in 2017; 161 in 2018, 164 in 2019, and 136 in 2020. These statistics

reveal significant annual percentage increases of 10%, 55%, 12% and 2%, with a recent decrease of 17%. With the exception of 2020, the death toll increased despite the lifesaving deployment of naloxone by EMS and Law Enforcement to suspected Opioid overdose victims. Burlington County EMS and Law Enforcement deployed naloxone 556 times in 2015; 653 times in 2016; 914 times in 2017; 1023 times in 2018, 802 times in 2019, and 727 times in 2020. Deployments increased annually 17% from 2015-2016, 40% from 2016-2017 and 12% from 2017-2018. However, we saw a 22% decrease from 2018-2019.

In addition to the Opioid epidemic, Burlington County saw another year of increased shootings. In 2020, there were approximately eighty (80) shootings reported in Burlington County that accounted for fifty (50) shooting hits, twenty-two (22) shooting no-hits, and eight (8) homicides. This marks an eighty-two percent (82%) increase in shootings from the forty-four (44) shootings reported in 2019. Many of these shootings were attributed to known gang members and violent offenders engaged in drug and/or gun trafficking/violence. Prominent gangs existing in Burlington County are Gotti Boy Movement (GBM), Brothers, Death, Loyalty (BDL), Sex, Money, Murder (SMM) Bloods, G-Shine Bloods, Taliban Crew, Muslims Over Everything (MOE), Rondo, Top Savages, and Pagans Outlaw Motorcycle Gang.

In an effort to deter gang activity and reduce shootings, GGNTF utilized intelligence-led policing tactics to identify, target, and disrupt the individuals and criminal networks responsible for gun violence and the distribution of narcotics. With the assistance of the Intelligence Services Unit (ISU), GGNTF experienced great success sharing real-time, social media intelligence with our local, state, and federal partners. In many instances,

detectives seized various firearms and controlled dangerous substances from known gang members and violent offenders after observing them pose with firearms and controlled dangerous substances (CDS) in public posts. These short-term investigations were highly effective in combating violent offenders and gang members that are not involved in drug and/or gun trafficking and where traditional investigative tactics typically have failed.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED DURING 2020

STATE V. THOMAS LOCKER

On July 6, 2020, a BCPO GGNTF detective and Agent from the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms met with a Cooperating Witness (CW) to have him/her meet with Thomas Locker at his residence, located at 155 Highland Road, Jobstown, New Jersey (155 Highland Road). The purpose of this meeting was to have the CW engage in conversation about the sale of an 80% lower receiver. The CW was supplied with a digital recording device and followed him/her to the area of 155 Highland Road. The CW met with Locker while the detective monitored the interaction between CW and Locker from a nearby location. While meeting with the CW, Locker spoke about repairing firearms as well as firearms located on his property. After the meeting between the CW and Locker, the detective met with the CW and debriefed him/her.

On July 7, 2020, the detective and the special agent met with the CW. The purpose of this meeting was to have the CW attempt to purchase the 80% lower receiver from Locker. The CW was supplied with operational funds and a digital recording device and subsequently followed to the area of Highland Road. The CW met with Locker and purchased the lower receiver. The detective monitored the purchase from a nearby location. Once the purchase was made, the detective followed the CW to a prearranged met location and the CW turned over a lower receiver that he/she purchased from Locker. The detective debriefed the CW and transported the lower receiver back to the GGNTF facility and secured the receiver into evidence.

On July 14, 2020, a Search Warrant was executed at 155 Highland Road. A search of Locker's bedroom and surrounding areas resulted in the seizure of fifteen (15) firearms, three (3) magazines, three (3) silencers, and three (3) explosive devices. In addition, three (3) additional firearms were located in the bedroom of Locker's roommate, identified as Alexander Kovalik (Kovalik). As a result of the Search Warrant, Locker and Kovalik were both charged with committing numerous firearms and explosives crimes.

STATE V. ROBERT MARGESON

On July 21, 2020, Detective William Knecht of the Medford Township Police Department and a detective from the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force cultivated a Confidential Informant (CI) who reported Robert Margeson was distributing large amounts of methamphetamine in Burlington and Mercer counties. The CI agreed to actively cooperate with an investigation targeting Margeson.

During a consensually intercepted telephone call between the CI and Margeson, Margeson agreed to sell the CI five ounces of Methamphetamine.

Margeson subsequently traveled to Maple Shade where law enforcement conducted a motor vehicle stop of Margeson's vehicle. Located in plain view on the back-passenger floor of Margeson's vehicle was approximately five ounces of methamphetamine.

The detective obtained a Search Warrant for Margeson's residence. As a result of the Search Warrant an additional 15 grams of methamphetamine were seized. Margeson was taken to the hospital because he complained of chest pain. Once at the hospital, an additional ounce of methamphetamine was seized from Margeson.

STATE V. ANDREW FAGAN & JAMES DUNN

On July 23, 2020, two detectives from the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Gangs, Guns, and Narcotics Task Force cultivated a Confidential Informant (CI) who reported James Dunn was distributing large amounts of Methamphetamine in Burlington County.

Acting in an undercover role as a narcotics purchaser, one of the detectives purchased a total of approximately nine ounces of methamphetamine from Dunn during multiple undercover narcotics purchases which occurred over the course of six months.

In addition, numerous Communication Data Warrants and Search Warrants were authorized including seven (7) Dialed Number Retriever Warrants, two Global Positioning System Warrants, and five Search Warrants. The Dialed Number Retrievers were essential to identifying Andrew Fagan as Dunn's source of supply.

On December 23, 2020, Search Warrants were executed on Fagan and his two residences located at 56 Foxglove Drive Delran, New Jersey and 31 ½ E. Hancock Street Riverside, New Jersey. As a result of these Search Warrants, eight ounces of methamphetamine and six firearms were seized. In addition, an Improvised Explosive Device (IED) was found at the E. Hancock Street location.

One of the detectives arrested Andrew Fagan and he was taken into custody. Fagan was charged with First-Degree Distribution of methamphetamine, Third-Degree possession of methamphetamine, and Third-Degree Possession of an IED.

On January 6, 2021, a Search Warrant was executed at 318 Pardee Boulevard in the Browns Mills section of Pemberton Township, New Jersey This was the known address of Dunn. During the search of 318 Pardee Boulevard, two IEDs were found in Dunn's bedroom. Dunn was taken into custody and transported back to the Pemberton Township Police Department headquarters. Dunn was charged with Second-Degree Distribution of methamphetamine, Third-Degree Possession of methamphetamine, and Third-Degree Possession of an IED.

GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT

The Grand Jury/Case Screening Unit receives and reviews all cases in which an adult has been charged with an indictable offense and some in which they are charged as a disorderly persons offense. These complaints can originate from a private citizen, from one of the 41 municipalities in the county, or from other institutions that serve the county such as Transit Police or Department of Corrections. As a general rule, the unit does not conduct its own independent investigations.

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 Grand Jury/Case Screening 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.

In addition to screening each case, the assistant prosecutors in the Screening/Grand Jury Unit administer the Pre-Indictment Conferences, referred to as PIC. Pre-Indictment Conferences are 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 resolve by way of a plea to an accusation, with some occasionally being resolved for a lesser disorderly person offense.

Another facet of the Screening/Grand Jury 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 his or her 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 assistant prosecutor assigned to Drug Court also handles all pleas, sentencing, and violations of probation for Drug Court participants who fail to adhere to the requirements of the program or accrue new charges.

Another alternative disposition route is the Veteran's Diversion Program. This program is open to any current or former military person who is charged with non-violent third-, fourth-, or disorderly persons offenses. Eligible veterans can receive treatment-based early intervention support and services through approved treatment providers and mentoring by a former service member. Participants must meet all requirements to participate and remain in the Veteran's Diversion Program and then must successfully complete the

program within two years of the date of the diversion. Those veterans who successfully complete the program have their charges dismissed.

If a case does not resolve through a Pre-Indictment plea or admission into an alternative program, the county detectives and agents assigned to the Screening/Grand Jury Unit finalize the case. They collect outstanding evidence, prepare discovery, and then turn the case over to the assigned assistant prosecutor who then reviews the case for grand jury.

During the subsequent grand jury presentation, the assistant prosecutors elicit testimony from officers from around the county and from within the office. If the Grand Jury finds there is enough evidence to move the case onto the trial phase, a True Bill Indictment is returned. The grand jury

does not determine guilt or innocence. If the Grand Jury finds there is not presently enough evidence, it returns a No Bill and the matter is administratively dismissed. Currently, there are two Burlington County grand jury panels, each serving one day per week for eighteen weeks.

A large part of the Screening/Grand Jury Unit is handling the increased work that started on January 1, 2017, when New Jersey implemented the Criminal Justice Reform system, which was a sweeping restructuring of 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, http://www.nj.gov/oag/dcj/agguide/directives/2016-6_Law-Enforcement.pdf (2018)].

Before the advent of Criminal Justice 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 their bail were imprisoned until the resolution of their matter. This often adversely impacted those 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 by thousands.

Under the Criminal Justice 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 of each week. Assistant prosecutors in the Screening/Grand Jury Unit handle all detention motions filed within the county, aside from homicide cases and a few cases handled by the Attorney General's Office. The detective and prosecutor's agent assigned to this Criminal Justice Reform subunit are responsible for ensuring that each file is ready for its detention hearing and then, if the defendant is detained, further readying the case for presentment to the Grand Jury. All First Appearances and Detention Hearings continued during the COVID-19 pandemic, as required, although the Court transitioned the hearings to a virtual format.

Every defendant who remains detained following his or her detention hearing must normally have his or her case either indicted by the Grand Jury or resolved within 90 days. Due to the pandemic, in person Grand Jury presentments were suspended for the majority of 2020.

They resumed in person for only one week in November before being suspended again due to rising COVID numbers. The Court extended the time by which the State must indict detained defendants, called "excludable time" from March 2020 through April 2021.

Those defendants who are released by the court at their detention hearing must continue to abide by the terms of their pre-trial release until their matter is resolved. If they do not, the court can file a Violation of Monitoring and may schedule a hearing to determine if the defendant's release should be revoked because of the violation. In addition to handling the First Appearances and detention hearings, assistant prosecutors in the Screening/Grand Jury Unit also handle these Violation of Monitoring hearings, which occur every Tuesday and Thursday.

The Screening/Grand Jury Unit consists of seven or eight Assistant Prosecutors, consisting of the unit Supervisor, a Drug Court assistant prosecutor, the Pre-Indictment Program assistant prosecutor, the Criminal Justice Reform assistant prosecutor and three- or four-line assistant prosecutors. The unit also includes two detectives, four prosecutor's agents, and five members of the clerical support staff.

In 2020, the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office received and reviewed complaints for almost 4,200 defendants and an additional 400 complaints for defendants facing only Disorderly Persons charges who were nonetheless charged on a warrant, and therefore, required a First Appearance. The detective and agents in the unit investigated and prepared for grand jury 1,145 cases. The investigators assigned to the Criminal Justice Reform subunit prepared almost 1,000 cases for detention hearings and 200 cases for indictment. The Office indicted 323 defendants during 2020, although it pled over 350 defendants to an accusation during that time.

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 offenses involving the exploitation of children, network intrusion, hacking and DNS attacks. The unit is staffed by two Detectives, a Prosecutor's Agent and a Detective Sergeant, who is the investigative Supervisor. Additionally, the Cinnaminson Township Police Department has assigned two officers as a part time Task Force Officers and the United States – Homeland Security Investigations – Cherry Hill Office has assigned a Special Agent as a Task Force Officer with the High-Tech Crimes Unit

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 sexual abuse material, 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 2020, the High-Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit assisted in 637 digital forensic examinations, on over 483 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 numerous Internet Safety Presentations, relating to Basic Internet Safety, Cyberbullying and Sexting. The presentations were mainly to student at various schools throughout Burlington County. Some presentations were to parents and also as part of the Burlington County Sheriff's Youth Police Academy. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic many of the presentations could not be completed.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED DURING 2020

OPERATION SAFE QUARANTINE

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, in conjunction with local, state and federal agencies, concentrated during the pandemic on child exploitation investigations. The resulting dramatic increase in Internet activity while children were not attending in-person school throughout the state increased opportunities for sexual exploitation of children online. This operation resulted in over 24 arrests and many of the individuals have subsequently pled guilty to the offenses for which they were charged.

STATE V. MARIO PULCINI

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office and the United States Homeland Security Investigations initiated a proactive investigation into individuals possessing child sexual abuse material through Peer-2-Peer file sharing networks. In this case, the IP address that was used to search for Child sexual abuse material came back to a residence in Mount Laurel Township.

A search warrant was 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 TEAMS Unit, United States Homeland Security Investigations and the Mount Laurel Township Police Department. Marco Pulcini was arrested and charged with Distribution and Possession of child sexual abuse material. A forensic examination of the digital items seized was conducted by the High-Tech Crimes Unit, who ultimately located over 100,000 child sexual abuse images and videos. The case is pending Grand Jury. The case was investigated by Special Agent Jennifer Miller the United States – Homeland Security Investigations.

STATE V. JOHN EMILIO

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated a Proactive investigation into individuals exploiting children in different online chat applications. A member of the High-Tech Crimes Unit portraying a 14-year-old female engaged in communication with John Emilio. Emilio, who was charged in February 2020, believed he was sending pictures of his genitals and videos of himself masturbating to a 14-year-old girl, but the actual recipient was a detective from the BCPO High-Tech Crimes Unit. He attempted to arrange a meeting at a Cinnaminson Township motel to have sex with the girl. On December 23, 2020 John Emilio pled guilty to Attempted Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Impairing or Debauching) a crime of the Third Degree (Recommended sentence 3 years in New Jersey State Prison and parole supervision for life and Megan's Law) and will be sentenced on March 24, 2021. The case was investigated by DSgt. Dave Kohler.

STATE V. RYAN FISCHER

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office initiated a Proactive investigation into individuals exploiting children in different online chat applications. A member of the High-Tech Crimes Unit portraying a 14-year-old female engaged in communication with Ryan Fischer. Fischer, who was charged in March 2020, believed he was sending pictures of his genitals and videos of himself masturbating to a 14-year-old girl, but the actual recipient was a detective from the BCPO High-Tech Crimes Unit. He attempted to arrange a meeting at a Bordentown Township motel to have sex with the girl. On July 15, 2020 Ryan Fischer pled guilty to Attempted Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Impairing or Debauching) a crime of the Third Degree and was later sentenced to three years in New Jersey state prison and parole supervision for life and Megan's Law. The case was investigated by DSgt. Dave Kohler.

STATE V. SEAN HIGGINS

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 Cybertip report from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) that a juvenile male in Pennsylvania was being exploited after sending images of his genitals to another individual. A second Cybertip report was forwarded to BCPO after another juvenile male in Alabama was being exploited after sending images of his genitals to another individual. The IP addresses that was used to upload the images came back to a residence in Palmyra Borough and a church in Hainesport Township.

The investigation revealed that Sean Higgins was portraying himself as a juvenile female and would extort numerous juvenile males into sending images and direct them to get naked and perform sexual acts, all which were recorded without their knowledge. Sean Higgins lived at the Palmyra Borough residence and worked at the church in Hainesport Township.

The High-Tech Crimes Unit obtained a search warrant for the residence in Palmyra Borough and the church in Hainesport 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 Investigation Unit and Bordentown Barracks, United States Homeland Security Investigations, and the Palmyra Borough Police Department.

A forensic examination of the digital items seized was conducted by the High-Tech Crimes Unit, who ultimately located over 1,000 child sexual abuse images and videos in cloud storage and also on devices associated with Sean Higgins. Higgins as charged with six counts of Manufacturing Child Sexual Abuse Material (First Degree), one count of Aggravated Sexual Assault (First Degree), five counts of Distribution of Child Sex Abuse Material (Second Degree), one count of Sexual Assault (Second Degree), six counts of Possession of Child Sex Abuse Material (Third Degree), six counts of Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Third Degree), and one count each of Criminal Sexual Contact (Fourth Degree), Obstruction (Fourth Degree) and Contempt (Fourth Degree). The investigation into additional victims within the State of New Jersey and throughout the United States is ongoing. The case was investigated by TFO Geoffrey Chiumento.

HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT

The Burlington County Homeland Security Unit is a sub-section of the Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF) and Major Crimes Units (MCU). The role of the Homeland Security Unit is to deter, detect and prevent acts of terrorism. There is one Detective assigned to the Homeland Security Unit who serves as the County Counter-Terrorism Coordinator. Gangs, Guns and Narcotics Task Force and 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 the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness, 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 the critical infrastructures 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 the N.J. Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness. In conjunction with the

N.J. Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness 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 2020 by a Supervising Data Control Clerk, who performs a multitude of duties to assist staff with investigative and prosecutorial pursuits, along with a keyboarding clerk and a part-time employee.

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 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 County Mainframe Systems.

ISU is responsible for scanning all mail and other documents that pertain to prosecutor adult case files. During 2020, 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 County Mainframe Systems.

The BCPO Assistant 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.

The Insurance Fraud Unit has 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 has 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.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT

In 2006, the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Intelligence Services Unit (ISU) was established with the primary responsibility for supporting active criminal investigations with real-time, relevant intelligence information that can provide assistance tracking criminal activity and crime trends. The ISU is comprised of one Detective and a trained Intelligence Analyst holding the title of Prosecutor's Agent. In June 2007, Burlington County applied for and received The Bureau of Justice Assistance – Targeting Violent Crime Initiative (TCVI) federal grant which was co-written by the Burlington County Sheriff's Department and the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office. In September of 2007, a federal grant award of \$492,875 was received, along with \$97,358 approved by the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders. As a result, these initial investments provided the InfoShare Intelligence Management module, along with various other software programs, training, and equipment. The InfoShare Intelligence Module satisfied the requirements of federal guidelines 28 CFR Part 23, as well as the New Jersey Attorney General Intelligence Guidelines for criminal intelligence, while digitally facilitating the documentation, tracking, and dissemination such information.

Since its formation, the ISU has established a broad range of responsibilities and provides an array of services within the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, as well as to outside law enforcement agencies. These responsibilities primarily include identifying sources of information, the collection of relevant criminal information and intelligence, analysis of criminal intelligence, and the dissemination of criminal intelligence within the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office and to other law enforcement partners. The following are a list of functions performed by the ISU:

Intelligence Advisories: In 2020, ISU created a new email-based system of disseminating relevant criminal intelligence to our law enforcement partners by way of intelligence advisories. These advisories are focused on officer safety, situational awareness, significant arrests, potential for violence, social media posts of concern, and homeland security. Once an advisory is approved for dissemination, it is sent to over 600 local, county, state, and federal law enforcement officer email accounts. Furthermore, ISU serves as the primary recipient of APB.net (All Points Bulletin) messages. An email-based system, APB.net provides information regarding criminal activity throughout New Jersey and across the country. The ISU receives these bulletins and monitors them for similarities, the potential for services that may be provided to support an investigation, and referrals to/from agencies that may benefit from sharing information.

Shootings and Ballistics Analysis: Burlington County saw an 82% increase in shootings from 2019 to 2020. Taking an in-depth approach to firearms related incidents, ISU created an intelligence product that provides a tangible, comprehensive analysis of every reported shooting incident in the County. The intelligence product is cloud-based and available "real-time" to detectives responding to shootings and homicides. In addition, ISU is the primary liaison to the New Jersey State Police Ballistics Unit and the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN).

This requires the coordination and dissemination of information with local, county, and state law enforcement agencies to establish forensic links to firearms-related investigations ranging from gun recoveries, projectile/casing recoveries, shooting no-hit reports, shooting hit reports, and homicides.

Criminal Enterprise and Gang Identification: ISU designed the Subject Profile/Associations Report (SPAR) to serve as a brief overview and reference for investigators during the course of their investigations. This report highlights suspected criminals and profiles pertinent information. When these reports are finalized and approved, they are disseminated to a target audience and uploaded into a cloud-based intelligence system where the information is accessible from anywhere.

Social Media Monitoring: Proactive monitoring of potential and/or suspected criminal activity has also been deemed vital in the response to and prevention of criminal acts. Open-source information and social media monitoring have proven to be invaluable sources of information. The ISU has developed an extensive database of known criminal offender social media accounts, and proactively monitors publicly available social media pages and outlets for useful information that can be documented, analyzed, and disseminated accordingly.

Case Deconfliction: ISU serves as the administrator of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Case Explorer/Deconfliction system, which is an essential tool for the safety and integrity of ongoing criminal investigations.

Training: ISU has been committed to providing training to our law enforcement partners via an ISU block of instruction during the Criminal Investigations Course for Law Enforcement. ISU also provides training on Gang Awareness for School Administrators.

Naloxone (Narcan) Distribution: ISU coordinates the Naloxone (Narcan) distribution program for all Burlington County municipal law enforcement agencies, and also serves as the primary Naloxone County Coordinator for overdose monitoring via the State's ODMap and ODForm databases.

COVID-19: The COVID-19 pandemic quickly reshaped our entire way of operating at the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, and it mandated consistent monitoring and dissemination of COVID-19 related information to the Office administration.

Mass Public Demonstrations: In 2020, several high-profile incidents led to mass public demonstrations throughout the country. ISU was vital to identifying potential threats to ensure the safety of the public. The ISU served as the primary liaison for demonstration and/or civil unrest identification, monitoring, and reporting. This effort required the consistent monitoring of news and social media outlets to effectively report and track any events. In 2020, the ISU was responsible for reporting and tracking over 80 events in Burlington County while coordinating real-time updates and reporting event outcomes.

MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – SPECIAL VICTIMS SECTION

The Special Victims Unit, formerly known as the Sexual Assault/Child Abuse Unit (SACA), 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.

SACA 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

35

minimize the impact of the criminal investigation on an already traumatized child. The MDT provides both pre- and post-prosecution assistance for the child victim.

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 Special Victims Unit. The Megan's Law Unit works closely with the SVU 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 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 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.

During 2020, seven 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 2020, the SART/SANE program was responsible for responding to 80 calls and conducting 66 forensic examinations of individuals who reported being victims of sexual assault.

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED DURING 2020

STATE V. CHRISTOPHER ELDER

On September 28, 2020, 36-year-old Christopher Elder was charged with multiple counts of Sexual Assault (Second Degree) and Endangering the Welfare of a Child (Second Degree) out of three Burlington County jurisdictions (Burlington Township, Riverside, and Edgewater Park). The sexual acts alleged spanned from 2011-2016 and involved three minor victims. The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office and Burlington Township Police Department detectives jointly investigated the allegations of sexually inappropriate conduct which occurred when the children were approximately 7-to-9 years old. On September 28, 2020 the suspect was located at the North View Motel in Florence Township where he had been residing. He agreed to come to the Burlington Township Police station for an interview and there provided a Mirandized video-recorded statement wherein he confessed to performing sexual acts with or upon the victims.

Following his confession, he was charged and then detained on October 2, 2020. On February 3, 2021, the defendant pled guilty to an accusation charging one count of First Degree Aggravated Sexual Assault and one count of Second Degree Endangering the Welfare of a Child. Under the plea agreement he was sentenced on April 21, 2021 to a term of 15 years in New Jersey state prison with a 15-year period of parole ineligibility under the sentencing provisions of the Jessica Lunsford Act and a concurrent five-year sentence on the Second-Degree charge of Endangering the Welfare of a Child. The defendant is subject to all Megan's Law provisions, to include Parole Supervision for Life.

STATE V. EDMONDO DIPAOLO

Edmondo DiPaolo was charged by New Jersey State Police on March 21, 2020 with the offenses of Aggravated Sexual Assault, Aggravated Assault, and Endangering the Welfare of a Child for abuse he inflicted upon a 16-year-old severely developmentally impaired female in his medical care. He had been employed as a home health aide and been caring for the child since September of 2019. The matter was initially being investigated for a physical injury to the victim. Police had been called out to the home on March 20 for a medical assist report. Police later obtained video footage from a security system which monitors the home and observed the suspect performing sexual acts upon her and causing physical pain and injury. The BCPO Hi-Tech Unit assisted with the securing and review of the volumes of video evidence. The defendant was arrested and lodged in the Burlington County Jail on March 20, 2020. Upon review of the footage available from the system (back to January) it was learned that there had been previous incidents, and on April 7, 2020 additional charges of Aggravated Sexual Assault and Endangering were filed to encompass the broader timeframe and additional acts. The BCPO filed to detain the defendant and appealed from the court's denial of that motion. The defendant was released and continues on pretrial monitoring with home detention. The matter is pending presentation to a Grand Jury.

STATE V. SHAWN MIDGETTE

The 28-year-old defendant was charged out of both Willingboro and Mount Holly Townships with two separate stranger rape incidents on back-to-back dates in July. The defendant was charged on July 27, 2020 out of Willingboro Township with Aggravated Sexual Assault (First Degree), Robbery (First Degree), Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose (Third Degree), Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Fourth Degree), and Certain Persons (Fourth Degree) for the July 24, 2020 forcible sexual assault of a 78-year-old woman in her car after she gave him a ride from a convenience store in Westampton. He was also charged with Disorderly Persons offenses of Obstruction and Resisting Arrest related to his July 27th arrest. The BCPO Crime Scene Unit responded and located biological fluid in the interior of the vehicle and collected same for evidence and later forensic analysis. Surveillance footage was able to be secured from the stores near the scene which showed the defendant's interactions with the victim at the store and in the parking lot. The defendant was also charged out of Mount Holly with Aggravated Sexual Assault (First Degree), Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose (Third Degree), Unlawful Possession of a Weapon (Fourth Degree), and Certain Persons

(Fourth Degree) for the July 25th forcible sexual assault of an adult woman in the Monroe Park area of Mount Holly. The defendant was identified by Willingboro police, apprehended, and interviewed on July 27, 2020 at the Willingboro Township Police Department. He was charged and lodged in the Burlington County Jail, and the BCPO moved for the suspect to be detained. The court granted the motion and he currently continues in custody. He was indicted on June 24 and 29, 2021. He is pending further court proceedings after being deemed by the court to be presently “unfit to proceed” following a competency examination.

MAJOR CRIMES UNIT – VIOLENT OFFENDERS SECTION

The Major Crimes Unit of the Burlington County Prosecutor’s office is 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. One detective and one assistant prosecutor in the unit are also assigned to investigate and prosecute all bias crimes related incidents.

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

SIGNIFICANT CASES PROSECUTED DURING 2020

STATE V. JAWAAD ALI, ANTHONY SERMOND-GUYTON AND ASIA BOONE

On May 11, 2020, at 11:08 am officers from the Mount Laurel Township Police Department were dispatched to the third floor of the Fairfield Inn for an unresponsive male in the hallway. The third floor of the hotel had been vacant due to the pandemic. Upon arrival, the victim was found face down on the floor, deceased. The victim was identified as 31-year-old Samer Alhalayqa. During the investigation, the Medical Examiner’s office arrived and reported that it appeared as if the victim’s body had been moved from its place of death. The victim had been reported missing out of Camden on May 9, 2020. The victim’s father-in law reported that the victim had an Apple I-phone and a TD bank debit card with him. Neither of these items was found with the victim’s body. Security video from victim’s Camden Apartment showed the victim standing in front of 309 S. Broadway on May 8, 2020 wearing a dark-colored backpack and utilizing a cell phone. The victim then calls for an Uber ride. Security footage from the Fairfield Inn shows the

victim arriving at the hotel on May 8 at 9:55 PM. At this time, he was still wearing the dark colored backpack and utilizing his cell phone. Multiple purchases were made or attempted on the victim's debit card beginning on May 9. Several of these purchases were attempted by a subject by the name of Jawaad Ali. One of the first purchases was made at the Lukoil gas station which is near the hotel. Video from that purchase reveals two black males purchasing several items. One of these males strongly resembles Ali. Another purchase was made from a Papa John's Pizza shop, and the delivery went to 700 7th Street South in Camden. Video was obtained of this purchase and showed two black males meeting the delivery person. Once again one of these males strongly resembled Ali. Additionally, Ali appeared to be holding a backpack that the suspect at Lukoil was wearing at the time of that purchase. After May 9, attempts were still being made to utilize the victim's debit card at various locations. The second suspect was identified through JPAY (correctional facility communications company) as Anthony Sermond-Guyton. The victim's call detail records show him communicating with Ali through calls and texts from the time the victim leaves work until the time of his suspected death. On May 26, 2020, Ali was arrested for trespassing at the Fairfield Inn by MLPD and two backpacks, two cell phones, and a tablet were seized. Ali was also linked to vacant rooms on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors of the hotel. Search warrants were conducted and CDWs were obtained for the phones and tablet. Receipts linking Ali to addresses of fraudulent orders were located along with tools for getting into the hotel rooms. Burlington County Medical Examiner Dr. Ian Hood ruled that the victim died from asphyxiation and the manner of death was homicide. Examination of cell phone information revealed 104 text messages between Ali and Sermond-Guyton from May 7th to May 16th. These text messages discussed using a room at the Fairfield Inn where there are no cameras and the content appears to be discussion of a planned robbery. On May 9th, after the homicide, Ali sends a text that payments are going through on the victim's card and that he just paid two months of his phone bill. Sermond-Guyton later sends a text saying some of the orders were canceled by the bank. Ali texts that all three of them are going to be good. On June 8, 2020, all three individuals were picked up and invited back to the Prosecutor's Office for interviews. In Ali's statement to the police, he stated that he was provided a debit card with the PIN number from a smaller male who robbed the card from the victim. Ali knew this male as Lil B and stated that he and Lil B used the card at a Lukoil to make an ATM transaction. Both Ali and Sermond-Guyton were captured on surveillance video making this transaction. Ali stated that he was in contact with the victim to provide him with a prostitute. He stated that he then gave his cell phone to a female by the name of Asia (Boone) to pretend to be the prostitute and get the victim to the hotel. Ali stated that he had no knowledge of any robbery plot. Later in his statement Ali advised that he knew that the victim had been harmed and stated that he continued to use the victim's debit card. Sermond-Guyton stated that he was present during the robbery and killing of the victim. He advised that prior to the incident, Ali contacted him and approached him in Camden about doing a job to make some money. He stated that the victim had money and they were conspiring to rob him. They then used Sermond-Guyton's girlfriend, Boone, to speak with the victim so that he would believe it was the prostitute he was supposed to meet. They then took a bus to Mount Laurel where the meeting with the prostitute was supposed to take place. When they got there, Sermond-Guyton met with the victim on the third floor and directed him to room 324 where Ali was hiding. When the victim entered

the room, Ali struck him and demanded his money. During this altercation Sermond-Guyton indicated that he observed the victim seated on the bed with his hands handcuffed behind his back. Ali was demanding his personal information and the victim complied. At one point, Sermond-Guyton stated he walked out of the room and heard the victim struggling. When he walked back into the room, he observed the victim on the bed with a bag over his head. Ali told him to step outside so he could “clean up.” He exited the room and Ali locked the door. Sermond-Guyton stated that he heard a struggle inside the room that lasted approximately 20 minutes. When he re-entered the room, he observed the victim lying on the floor with his hands still handcuffed. He checked the victim for a pulse and found none. He then noticed that the victim’s face was purple. Ali dragged the victim’s body into the hallway by his ankles. Both males then left the hotel and began to utilize the victim’s bank card at various locations. As a result, both males were charged with various offenses including Murder, Robbery, Conspiracy to Commit Robbery, Credit Card Offenses and Kidnapping. Asia Boone was charged with Conspiracy to Commit Robbery. Sermond-Guyton eventually pled to an accusation to Aggravated Manslaughter in exchange for sentencing recommendation of 22 years and cooperation against his co-defendants. Boone and Ali are pending Grand Jury. This case was investigated by Detective Brian Cunningham of the Burlington County Prosecutors Office and Detective Sean Bristow of the Mount Laurel Police Department. Jamie Hutchinson is the assistant prosecutor on the case.

STATE V. BRUCE GOMOLA

On July 24, 2020 at 12:50 p.m. officers from the Mount Laurel Police Department responded to New Jersey Urology located at 15000 Midlantic Drive for a reported shooting. Upon arrival, MLPD Detective Aaron Harty made contact with facility director Catherine Martin who described the suspect as an older white male wearing a long blue shirt. The suspect was observed getting into a silver SUV that left the facility towards Route 38. Ms. Martin identified the suspect as Bruce Gomola, Jr. and stated that he was unhappy with the treatment being provided to his father. Gomola argued with the victim identified, as Stephanie Horton, while in the hallway area of the facility. The argument escalated and Gomola pulled out a gun and shot Ms. Horton in the chest. Detective Harty then made contact with another patient by the name of Daryl Moore who witnessed the incident. Moore stated that he heard one gunshot and saw the suspect reach down and pick up the shell casing. While Ms. Horton was being treated on scene another victim Bonita Liebe was being treated for a gunshot wound to the knee. While Detective Harty was outside speaking to Ms. Martin, Gomola approached and asked Harty if he could speak to him. Gomola then advised Harty that he was the one who shot the victim. Gomola was then taken into custody. A search incident to arrest resulted in the recovery of a 40-caliber handgun that was holstered on his right hip. A Burlington County Corrections Officer badge was clipped to defendant’s belt and one spent casing and one hollow point round were recovered from the defendant’s front pants pocket. At the time of Gondola’s arrest, he stated that he should have never left and that his father was still in

the car parked in the parking lot. Surveillance video at the facility captured the interior hallway where the incident occurred. The video depicts an altercation between Gomola and Horton. Gomola is observed walking towards Horton and pushing her out of camera view. Gomola is then observed reaching under his shirt, un-holstering his weapon and discharging the firearm. Gomola then advances towards Horton with the gun in his hand out of camera view. Gomola then re-enters camera view and is observed bending down and picking something up. Gomola then leaves the building and is seen running to his vehicle and departing the scene. Stephanie Horton and Bonita Liebe were both transported to Cooper University Hospital in Camden where Horton was pronounced dead from a gunshot wound to the chest. The bullet that killed Horton exited her back and appears to have struck Liebe in the knee. Liebe underwent surgery to repair damage to her leg and the bullet was recovered. On August 4, 2020, defendant was detained pending trial. He is currently being housed at the Camden County Jail and the matter is pending grand jury. This case was investigation by Detective Aaron Harty of the Mt. Laurel Police Department and a detective from the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office. Assistant Prosecutor Robert Van Gilst is the attorney assigned.

STATE V. KENNETH MACINTOSH

On October 14, 2020, at 3:45 PM, police responded to 429 Earl Street in Burlington City for a deceased female who was found by her roommate when he returned to their home. Upon arrival of the police, the body of 61-year-old Carla Nesmith was found lying face down. An autopsy revealed that the victim was beaten with a blunt object, stabbed multiple times and had her throat slashed. On the morning of the homicide the victim was on the phone with a friend and indicated to that individual that she was expecting a man by the name of Ken to come over that morning to talk. While Ms. Nesmith was on the phone with her friend, Ken arrived and the victim discontinued the call. Neighbors reported seeing a white male at the residence and he was later observed on video from the area leaving the neighborhood. This individual matched the description of the suspect, Kenneth Macintosh who was a handy man that would frequent the area. Macintosh was subsequently tracked to the Travel Lodge in Lumberton Township. The manager of the Travel Lodge indicated that the suspect was registered at the motel and used his driver's license as identification but he was not in the room upon arrival of the police. Surveillance was initiated and video of the travel lodge was reviewed and showed the suspect arriving at the motel a few hours after the homicide. Warrants were then prepared for the suspect's room. Before the warrant could be executed, the defendant was observed leaving another tenant's room. Detectives on scene began to approach the suspect who was seated on the steps outside of his room. As officers approached, the suspect fatally shot himself. The gun in the suspect's possession had Ms. Nesmith's name on it. Additionally, the defendant had a note in his possession indicating that this was the best course of action before he hurt anyone else. This case was investigated by BCPO Detective Leah McHale and Burlington City Police Department Detective Jamie Lambing.

PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Public Information Unit was staffed during 2020 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, and works with these organizations concerning 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 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 the 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.

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 goal of the SIU is to enhance the integrity of the of Burlington County law enforcement agencies, to improve the delivery of police services and properly address any complaints of misconduct. 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 implements an internal affairs policy that provides for meaningful and objective investigation of citizen complaints and police misconduct. The unit monitors and tracks the behaviors of law enforcement officers for incidents of misconduct and is responsible for Brady/Giglio reviews. The unit also conducts background investigations on prospective employees of the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office. The SIU adheres to the Attorney General policy requirements and is also responsible for providing internal affairs training to local law enforcement agencies as mandated by the New Jersey Attorney General.

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 DURING 2020

STATE V. DANIEL WATERFIELD

On October 31, 2018, the defendant, Daniel Waterfield, dumped the body of Kerri Stetser in the dirt along Purgatory Road in Southampton after she overdosed in the front seat of his pickup truck. Stetser died as a result of ingesting heroin and fentanyl, drugs that the defendant helped her buy earlier that day in Camden. Instead of rushing her to a hospital when she fell ill, the defendant enlisted a friend, Amanda Seth, to help him conceal Stetser's lifeless body. According to Seth, the defendant explained that "he didn't want to go to the hospital because he [was] afraid ... that he was going to get locked [up]." The defendant and Seth drove around for hours with Stetser silent in the front passenger seat before discarding her on the side of road. The deed done, Waterfield drove to McDonald's for dinner. That night, and throughout the next day, he communicated with Stetser's grandmother promising to help find her and claiming to have last seen her at the train station in Camden.

During an interview with the New Jersey State Police, Waterfield claimed that he was unaware that Stetser had died, instead believing she was taking a protracted "power-nap." However, an examination by Dr. Ian Hood, Chief Medical Examiner for Burlington County, concluded that she died quickly, and that she had likely been dead for hours before she was left along the roadside. Waterfield seemingly confirmed the same when he compared Stetser's body to "dead weight," while claiming that someone else "scooped her up" from his truck and walked away with her. What did he think would happen to Stetser that evening? "I figured Kerri would turn up today with bruises on her at Cooper Hospital, or worse." As for Stetser's decision to use heroin, Waterfield provided a blunt assessment, "You live by the sword, you die by it."

On February 25, 2020, the trial commenced. A jury returned a guilty verdict on the charge of Desecration of Human Remains and the defendant was sentenced to eight years in prison. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matthew Lynch.

STATE V. THOMAS MILLER

Before leaving for his honeymoon, Michael Benci boarded his cockatoo Amadeus at Bird Paradise in Burlington City. When he returned, Benci learned that his cockatoo's stay at the establishment was less than ideal. In fact, it was a nightmare. His bird was stolen.

An investigation revealed that on October 15, 2017, the defendant, Thomas Miller, strolled into Bird Paradise. Once inside, he opened Amadeus' cage, perched the bird on his arm and sauntered out the back door. Miller's attorney would later explain that his client "felt an instant connection with the bird." Store surveillance captured Miller's license plate, leading law enforcement to his Philadelphia home. Members of the Burlington City and Philadelphia police departments entered the residence and located Amadeus in the basement.

Reunited with Amadeus, Benci could tell the bird had been through quite an ordeal. His wings had been crudely clipped in an amateurish attempt to disguise his identity. The clipping, Benci recalled, “just made him look very sloppy. Lucky for us, the person who stole the bird did not clip off his identity ring around his leg!”

On February 6, 2020, the defendant pled guilty to the Theft of Amadeus. He was subsequently sentenced to a probationary term. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matthew Lynch.

STATE V. BRUCE NEAL

During the months of November and December of 2018, an investigation was conducted by the Burlington Township Police Department, FBI Greater Trenton Safe Streets Task Force, and the Burlington County Prosecutor’s Office Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force regarding the sale of narcotics in Burlington City.

On January 17, 2019, based upon information learned during the course of the investigation, a search warrant was issued for the person of Bruce Neal, his residence located at 423 York Street in Burlington City and his vehicle. The search revealed a loaded .40 caliber handgun, a kilo of cocaine and \$2,985 in cash. Neal was subsequently indicted by a Burlington County grand jury for Possession of Narcotics with the Intent to Distribute and various weapons offenses. At the time of the execution of the warrant, Neal was enrolled in the Drug Court Program in Burlington County.

On February 6, 2020, the defendant pled guilty. He was sentenced to a term of 14 years in State prison, seven of which are to be served without parole. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matt Lynch.

STATE V. WILLIE HYMON

On February 8, 2015, at approximately 9:30 p.m., Medford Township officers responded to 4 Chief Massasoit Trail for a reported home invasion. Upon arrival, officers met with the victim, Michael Tolstoy, age 64, a Vietnam veteran and Purple Heart recipient. He advised that two black males had entered his home, bound his arms with duct tape and bludgeoned him repeatedly with blunt objects and a screwdriver. As he was assaulted, the perpetrators demanded money, jewelry and guns and threatened to kill him should he contact the police. To ensure that he was unable to do so, they disabled his landline and took his cell phone. In addition, they stole \$225 in cash, a bottle of Maker’s Mark bourbon, a pair of gray gloves and fled in Tolstoy’s vehicle, a silver 2010 Cadillac. Upon their departure, Tolstoy managed to free himself and ran to a neighbor’s home to call the police.

Given his condition, he was transported to Virtua Hospital in Mount Holly for treatment. He sustained extensive physical injuries, including permanent vision impairment and multiple displaced disks in his neck, as well as cognitive injuries resulting in short term

memory loss. In light of the same, Tolstoy was unable to resume employment in the medical field as a nurse anesthetist.

Upon release from the hospital, Tolstoy met with investigators at his home. They located a tree branch stained with blood leaning against a wall by the entrance to his kitchen. Tolstoy advised that he believed the branch was one of the items that the perpetrators used to strike him. He also identified a crushed can of Seagram's Ginger Ale that was used to repeatedly bludgeon him in the head, as well as a piece of firewood that he believed he was struck with during the assault.

Following the search of the property, Tolstoy was interviewed. He advised that the perpetrators entered his home between approximately 8:00 and 8:30 p.m. He initially heard noises in the house while sitting in his recliner. Shortly thereafter, he was struck in the head from behind with a stick-like blunt object. He then observed two black males inside his home, neither of whom he recognized.

Both individuals demanded to know where he kept his money, guns and jewelry, and referenced the fact that he lived in Medford. He advised them that he had no money or guns in the home, but they refused to believe him. They then threatened to kill him if he didn't comply. The younger male placed a screwdriver beneath Tolstoy's eye, threatened to pour bleach on him and advised that they would return to kill him if he contacted the police. Tolstoy reported that while in the home, the males drank from a bottle of Maker's Mark bourbon that he kept in his kitchen and were overheard discussing how much they liked his Cadillac. After rummaging through the home, they fled in his car with his cell phone, Maker's Mark bottle, gloves and cash they removed from his wallet.

On February 10, 2015, Tolstoy met with a New Jersey State Police composite sketch artist. With Tolstoy's assistance, the artist prepared sketches of both individuals. Same were broadcast via bulletin on February 11, 2015.

On February 12, 2015, Keith Quattlebaum, an acquaintance of the defendant, contacted the Medford Township Police Department and advised that he recognized the individuals in the composite sketches as Willie Hymon and Urie Ridgeway. Quattlebaum indicated that he had observed Ridgeway operating a silver Cadillac on February 9th at approximately 8:00 a.m. He noted that both Hymon and Ridgeway came to his house later that same day in the Cadillac and had a bottle of Maker's Mark bourbon with them. While at the house, they attempted to sell him a cell phone with a blue case. Quattlebaum declined and they left.

Shortly thereafter, Tolstoy's Cadillac was located in Mount Holly. The car was locked and unoccupied. Mount Holly officers found Urie Ridgeway in the area in close proximity to the stolen vehicle. Upon his arrest, he had Tolstoy's car keys and cell phone in his pocket. Hymon was located in Mount Holly on a later date. When he was arrested, he had the victim's gloves on his person. In addition to the victim's property in their possession, cigarette butts recovered from the victim's car were submitted for forensic analysis. Both Hymon's and Ridgeway's DNA was found on same.

A jury trial commenced in January of 2017. As Urie Ridgeway had previously pled guilty, defendant Hymon was the sole defendant tried. During the trial, the victim, Michael Tolstoy, unequivocally and emphatically identified Hymon as one of the two individuals who broke into his home, tortured and terrorized him.

On January 18, 2017, the defendant was convicted. On appeal, the Appellate Division reversed and remanded the matter to the trial court. On June 30, 2020, the defendant pled open to First-Degree Robbery, despite being advised that the State would seek the maximum term of twenty years. On May 5, 2021, Hymon, age 66, was sentenced to 18 years in New Jersey State Prison. Said term is subject to the No Early Release Act.

STATE V. IRA JACKSON

On March 5, 2019, Officer Rossetti of Pemberton Township Police Department was on routine foot patrol in the area of the Red Carpet Inn. While patrolling the second floor of the hotel, Rossetti detected the odor of burnt marijuana. He also observed the defendant, Ira Jackson, whom he knew from prior drug related investigations. The defendant was standing outside of Room 207 with the door open and his back turned. As Rosetti approached, he observed items used in the sale and distribution of narcotics, as well as suspected drugs. The defendant, upon seeing the officer, attempted to shut the door. However, Rossetti was able to enter the room and advised the defendant that he was under arrest. The defendant fled. Eventually both the defendant and his girlfriend were taken into custody.

Based on the officer's observations, as well as an open-air K-9 search of a motor vehicle belonging to the defendant and his girlfriend, search warrants were obtained. A search of the room revealed a .38 caliber revolver, ammunition and suspected narcotics. Additional drugs were recovered from the vehicle as well as approximately \$1,100 in cash.

The defendant was indicted for various narcotics and weapons offenses. On March 2, 2020, he pled guilty to Unlawful Possession of a Weapon and was sentenced to five years in prison with a parole ineligibility term of three and a half years. The case was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matthew Jaxheimer.

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

The purpose of the Burlington County Prosecutor's 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 our full attention. The staff is comprised of one coordinator, five victim advocates, and one legal assistant, 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 providing 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 2020, 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 2020.

The range of referrals that our unit 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 legal assistant and the advocates. In 2020, approximately 50,000 case status letters, generated by our Infoshare system were mailed out to victims and witnesses of crime. The VINE system, along with assistance from victim advocates, ensured that over 1,500 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.

The staff is also actively involved in any homicide investigation that occurs within Burlington County. The Victim Witness Unit works closely with the BCPO Major Crimes Unit to provide immediate services to the families of homicide victims. 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 (VCCO) and other agencies.

Daily, 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 joins in recognizing National Crime Victims' Rights Week. During the week of April 19th through April 25th, 2020, 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 2020, "Seek Justice, Ensure Victims' Rights, Inspire Hope" 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 be a part of.

Traditionally, our office hosts two well-attended events during National Crime Victims' Rights Week – a Candlelight Memorial Vigil and a Breakfast. These events join victims, victim survivors, the law enforcement and prosecutor's office communities, advocates, and victim service providers in recognition of crime victims everywhere.

While COVID-19 prevented us from hosting these events in 2020, we presented a virtual Candlelighting Ceremony on September 25th, 2020, to commemorate the National Day of Remembrance for Homicide Victims and will continue this tradition moving forward.

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 to 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	421
b. Defendants with charges downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0	1925
c. Defendants accepted for pre-trial diversion	0	58
d. Defendants otherwise screened out	0	131
e. Defendants with change of venue	0	12
f. Accusations filed	0	395
g. Defendants with either indictable complaints authorized or charges approved for grand jury	0	2044
h. AOC Correction: Defendants who completed grand jury	0	0
TOTAL SCREENING DECISIONS FOR YEAR (add a - h)	0	4986

**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	58	56
2. Recommended for acceptance	58	55
3. Recommended for rejection	3	10
4. Accepted into program	58	60

Rev. 1995

**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	191	0
2. 1+ to 2 months	253	2
3. 2+ to 3 months	222	10
4. 3+ to 4 months	121	24
5. Over 4 months	1077	144
6. TOTAL defendant cases pending grand jury	1864	180

DEFENDANTS COMPLETING THE GRAND JURY PROCESS AND ACTION TAKEN

ACTION TAKEN	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants presented to the grand jury	395
2. Defendants indicted	323
3. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
4. Defendants no billed/no action	5
5. TOTAL defendants completing the grand jury process	323

DEFENDANTS CHARGED BY ACCUSATION

ACTION TAKEN	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
TOTAL Defendants charged through Accusation	395

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	13	1
2. 3+ to 6 months	0	0
3. 6+ to 9 months	2	2
4. 9+ to 12 months	67	44
5. 12+ to 24 months	106	165
6. 24+ months	36	573
7. TOTAL post-indictment/accusation defendant cases pending	224	783

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	6	12	7	10	22	91	96	0	218	1	5
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	0	0	2	2	1	4	4	0	10	7	0
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	0	7	0	2
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense											
a. Jury	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
8. Acceptance into diversion program	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	0	15	0	7
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	0	0	3	0	5	7	4	0	19	0	0
11. TOTAL dispositions	9	12	12	13	30	122	110	0	270	8	15

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	134	47	35	31	0	0	56	9	44	824
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	10	1	4	1	0	0	6	0	0	45
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	9	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	37
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense										
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
8. Acceptance into diversion program	14	3	5	2	0	0	2	0	2	64
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	24	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	2	70
11. TOTAL dispositions	191	53	47	37	0	0	67	9	49	1043

**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	37
2. TOTAL post-conviction relief applications/briefs filed involving the prosecutor's office	25
a. Defendants granted relief	0
b. Defendants denied relief	16
c. Defendants granted relief in part/Denied relief in part	0
d. Defendants dismissed/Withdrawn	4
3. TOTAL habeas corpus petitions/briefs filed involving the prosecutor's office	2
a. Defendants granted relief	0
b. Defendants denied relief	1
c. Defendants granted relief in part/Denied relief in part	0
d. Defendants dismissed/Withdrawn	0

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	4
2. Defendants accepted for prosecution as career criminals	4
3. TOTAL career criminal defendants completing grand jury process	1
1. 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	3
6. TOTAL defendant cases pending grand jury	3

**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. Dism., 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	29	1	0	67	6	103	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	151	5	2	292	26	476	3
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	180	6	2	359	32	579	3
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	143	5	2	332	21	503	2
1. Resulting in criminal charges	7	0	0	1	0	8	2
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	135	5	2	331	21	494	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	37	1	0	27	11	76	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	20	1	0	48	8	77	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	68	2	1	123	22	216	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	88	3	1	171	30	293	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	74	3	1	154	29	261	0
1. Resulting in criminal charges	5	0	0	10	2	17	0
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	1	1	0	2	0	4	0
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	3	0	0	2	0	5	0
d. Closed – No further action	65	2	1	140	27	235	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	14	0	0	17	1	32	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	0	1	2	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	1	0	0	0	2	3	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
1. 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	1	1	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	1	0	0	0	1	2	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	8	0	1	8	16	33	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	82	6	1	5	78	172	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	90	6	2	13	94	205	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	80	6	1	10	56	153	0
1. Resulting in criminal charges	3	0	0	6	23	32	0
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	2	0	0	1	7	10	0
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	1	0	0	0	1	2	0
d. Closed – No further action	74	6	1	3	34	118	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	10	0	1	3	38	52	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	6	9	15	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	0	0	0	2	6	8	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	0	0	0	8	15	23	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	0	0	0	8	15	23	0
1. 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	8	15	23	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	25	3	0	16	30	74	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	62	3	3	31	21	120	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	87	6	3	47	51	194	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	35	0	2	28	28	93	0
1. Resulting in criminal charges	2	0	0	3	4	9	0
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Closed – No further action	33	0	1	25	24	83	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	52	6	1	19	23	101	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	3	0	0	0	1	4	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	3	0	0	5	16	24	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	6	0	0	5	17	28	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	3	0	0	2	14	19	0
1. Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	3	0	0	2	13	18	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	2	0	0	4	3	9	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	16	3	0	0	0	19	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	83	18	0	0	0	101	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	97	23	0	0	0	120	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	75	18	0	0	0	93	0
1. Resulting in criminal charges	17	1	0	0	0	18	0
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Closed – No further action	58	16	0	0	0	74	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	16	3	0	0	0	19	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	4	1	0	22	18	45	1
2. Investigations opened during the year	1	0	0	11	29	41	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	5	1	0	33	47	86	1
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	3	0	0	12	18	33	1
1. Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	3	0	0	12	17	32	1
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	2	1	0	21	29	53	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	4	3	8	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	1	1	0	27	43	72	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	2	1	0	31	46	80	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	2	1	0	22	38	63	0
1. 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	1	1	2	0
d. Closed – No further action	2	1	0	21	37	61	0
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	0	0	9	8	17	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	107	9	1	171	92	380	1
2. Investigations opened during the year	451	35	7	496	242	1231	3
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 – 2)	556	46	8	667	334	1611	4
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. – d.)	415	33	6	568	220	1242	3
1. Resulting in criminal charges	34	1	0	20	31	86	2
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	5	1	1	3	7	17	0
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	5	0	0	3	1	10	0
d. Closed – No further action	373	30	5	542	189	1139	1
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	134	11	2	100	114	361	1

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	9
1. 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	6
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	1
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	5
1. Defendants indicted	5
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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
1. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	3
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	5
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	1
1. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	1
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 grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	32
1. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	1
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	19
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	0
1. 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 grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	3
1. 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	3
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	4
1. Defendants indicted	4
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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
1. 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 grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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
1. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	1
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	2
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	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	3
1. Defendants indicted	3
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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
1. 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	4
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	3
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	4
1. Defendants indicted	4
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	0
1. 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
1. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
1. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
1. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	72
1. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	1
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	5
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	2
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	13
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	31
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	16
1. Defendants indicted	16
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

APPEAL UNIT

Section IV. 8a

**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	48	1	0	0	2	0	5	4	60
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	52	3	6	0	2	0	2	2	67
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	5	0	0	0	21	0	26
4. Appellate briefs filed	22	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	32
5. STATE Appeals and – TOTAL DISPOSED Cross Appeals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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
e. Affirmed in part/Reversed and or remanded in part	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
6. DEFENSE Appeals – TOTAL DISPOSED	54	2	4	0	1	0	1	2	64
a. Conviction or order affirmed	40	2	3	0	1	0	0	2	48
b. Conviction or order reversed	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
c. Remanded or judgment modified	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
e. Affirmed in part/Reversed and or remanded in part	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
7. Appeals pending at the end of the year	46	2	1	0	3	0	5	4	61

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	1	1	0	0	2
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	0	2	11	2	0	15
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Appellate briefs filed	0	3	9	0	0	12
5. TOTAL APPEALS DISPOSED	0	3	8	1	0	12
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	2	8	1	0	11
b. Conviction or order reversed	0	1	0	0	0	1
c. Remanded or judgment modified	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Appeals pending at the end of the year	0	0	4	1	0	5

JUVENILE WAIVER DECISIONS

1.	Voluntary Waivers at Juvenile's Request	0
2.	Juvenile Waiver Motions by Prosecutor	
a.	Pending at Beginning of Year	0
b.	Motions Filed by Prosecutor this Year	2
3.	Juvenile Waiver Decisions (Prosecutor's Motions)	
a.	Waived on Prosecutor's Motion with Juvenile's Consent	0
b.	Waived on Prosecutor's Motion without Juvenile Consent and after a Hearing	0
c.	Motion Voluntarily Withdrawn by Prosecutor	0
d.	Waivers Denied	0
e.	Total Decisions (sum of 3a through 3d)	0
4.	Juvenile Waiver Motions filed by Prosecutor Pending at Year's End (2.a. + 2.b. - 3.e.)	2

JUVENILE HABITUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM WORKLOAD AND ADJUDICATIONS

WORKLOAD AND ADJUDICATIONS	NUMBER OF JUVENILES
1. Juveniles reviewed for acceptance into habitual offender program	0
2. Juveniles accepted for prosecution as habitual offenders	0
3. TOTAL juvenile adjudications	0
a. Adjudicated delinquent by admission, i.e., guilty plea	0
b. Adjudicated delinquent at hearing	0
c. Adjudicated not delinquent	0
d. Complaint dismissed or withdrawn	0
e. Adjudication adjourned, continuance granted	0

JUVENILE HABITUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM

CASE INTAKE CRITERIA (LIST)

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) VINE letters are sent to registered victims to notify them of an inmate's release from custody if their PIN number was not entered after 24-hours	X		X		X	
Other: Notifications are sent to victims for DOC max releases and/or application to community release programs	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		
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		
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 (Referrals)	X	X		
Other (specify) Court Accompaniment	X	X	X	X
Other: immediate Outreach in Homicide cases	X	X		
Other: SORO as SASPA assistance	X	X		
Other: HIV testing upon request after exposure	X	X	X	X

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	NUMBER	VALUE
1. Notice of intention to solicit funds received	N/A	
2. Expungement applications received	881	
3. TOTAL number of forfeiture actions	*81	
4. Number of motor vehicles obtained through forfeiture actions	8	
5. TOTAL value of property forfeited (add a. - c.)		\$208,705.76
a. Cash forfeited		\$160,666.76
b. Value of forfeited motor vehicles		**\$48,039.00
c. Value of other forfeited property		\$0
(Specify property)		
N/A		
*Total of 108 cases screened; 81 forfeitures filed; 27 forfeitures declined **Actual value by auction for 1 car \$2,704.14 Estimated value of 7 cars forfeited and turned over to police departments \$32,070.00		

ADULT DEFENDANTS WITH BIAS CRIME RELATED CHARGES DISPOSED

	TOTAL	NUMBER CONVICTED		ACQUITTED	DISMISSED	PTI	DOWNGRADE/ REMAND
		PLEA	TRIAL				
Number of bias crime incidents reported to BCPO in 2020	73 (adult & unknown)	2	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants indicted or disposed at the Superior Court level	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom application for extended term of imprisonment made	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom application was granted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom application was denied	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom simple assault was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom harassment was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	4	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	0	0	0	0	0	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 2020 – believed to be juvenile	8	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles disposed	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles for whom application was granted	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of juveniles for whom application was denied	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	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	0	0	0	0	0

POLICE PURSUIT SUMMARY REPORT

Agency Burlington County Prosecutor's Office	County Burlington
Reporting Period 01/01/2020 – 12/31/2020	
Person completing report DSgt. John Thompson	Date completed 02/22/21
Phone number 609-265-5345	

1. Number of pursuits initiated	44
2. Number of pursuits resulting in accidents	4
3. Number of pursuits resulting in injuries (NO DEATHS)	1
4. Number of pursuits resulting in death	1
5. Number of pursuits resulting in arrest	19
6. Number of vehicles in accidents	
a. Pursued vehicles	4
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	1
7. Number of people injured	
a. Pursued vehicles	1
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	0
d. Pedestrians	0
8. Number of people killed	
a. Pursued vehicles	1
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	0
d. Pedestrians	0
9. Number of people arrested	23
10. Number of pursuits in which a tire deflation device was used	0

Section IV.14Bb

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

County: BURLINGTON

Reporting Year: 2020

TABLE 1 -- COMPLAINTS FILED

Type of Complaint	Anonymous Complaints	Citizen Complaints	Agency Complaints	Total Complaints
Excessive Force	0	21	0	21
Improper Arrest	0	11	1	12
Improper Entry	0	2	0	2
Improper Search	0	2	1	3
Other Criminal Violation	0	5	1	6
Differential Treatment	0	25	0	25
Demeanor	0	53	2	55
Domestic Violence	0	0	1	1
Other Rule Violation	4	74	116	194
TOTAL	4	193	122	319

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE
 Reporting Year: 2020

County: BURLINGTON

TABLE 2 -- AGENCY DISPOSITIONS

	Sustained	Exonerated	Not Sustained	Unfounded	Administratively	Total
Excessive Force	1	11	3	1	0	16
Improper Arrest	1	7	0	2	0	10
Improper Entry	0	2	0	0	0	2
Improper Search	1	1	1	2	0	5
Other Criminal Violation	0	0	2	3	1	6
Differential Treatment	0	11	5	7	0	23
Demeanor	4	35	9	1	1	50
Domestic Violence	0	0	0	0	1	1
Other Rule Violation	82	45	19	15	14	175
TOTAL	89	112	39	31	17	288

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE County: BURLINGTON
 Reporting Year: 2020

TABLE 3 -- COURT DISPOSITIONS

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

Revised 2011

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)	2019	9,836,074	1,052,131
a. Salaries and Wages		9,279,083	698,177
b. Other Expenses		556,991	353,954
2. TOTAL Budgeted Appropriations, current report year (include all County, State and Federal funding)	2020	10,280,184	1,136,000
a. Salaries and Wages		9,547,248	650,000
b. Other Expenses		732,936	486,000