

People v Duplesis

2017 NY Slip Op 33300(U)

October 12, 2017

County Court, Orange County

Docket Number: 4640/17

Judge: Nicholas De Rosa

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

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

COUNTY COURT : ORANGE COUNTY
STATE OF NEW YORK

ORIGINAL

-----X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

-against-

IND. NO. 2017-462
INDEX NO. 4640/17

ELESCIA DUPLESIS,

DECISION AND ORDER

Defendant.

-----X

DE ROSA, N.

Defendant is charged in this indictment with the crimes of **Grand Larceny in the Third Degree**, a Class D Felony, in violation of §155.35(1); **Falsifying Business Records in the First Degree**, a Class E Felony, in violation of §175.10 and **Grand Larceny in the Fourth Degree** (10 counts), Class E Felonies, in violation of §155.30(1).

Defendant has moved for certain pre-trial relief which the Court, having considered: 1) the defendant's notice of motion and affirmation, submitted by Anthony C. Cillis, Esq., Jonna Spilbor Law 2) the People's affirmation in response, submitted by R. Alexander McManus, Esq., Assistant District Attorney, Orange County District Attorney's Office, and 3) the transcript of Grand Jury proceedings, decides as follows.

MOTION TO INSPECT GRAND JURY MINUTES

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that the Court has reviewed the minutes of the Grand Jury *in camera*. The Court

[*2]
finds that release of the minutes is not necessary to the determination of this motion. The Court further finds that the indictment is based upon legally sufficient evidence and that the Grand Jury was properly instructed with respect to the applicable law.

MOTION FOR A BILL OF PARTICULARS

Defendant's motion is denied as the information provided by the People is sufficient to enable defendant to adequately prepare or conduct a defense. CPL §200.95.

MOTION FOR DISCOVERY AND INSPECTION

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that the information was previously provided or inspection was consented to in the People's Voluntary Disclosure Form and/or Affirmation in Response. In all other respects, defendant's application is denied.

MOTION FOR BRADY MATERIAL

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that the District Attorney is directed to disclose to defendant any and all documents, materials and/or information, if any, required to be disclosed pursuant to Brady v. Maryland.

MOTION TO SUPPRESS STATEMENTS

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that a hearing is hereby ordered on the issue of the voluntariness of any statement made to law enforcement personnel as well as on any

[* 3]
issues relating to the legality of defendant's arrest and detention.

MOTION TO PRECLUDE

Defendant's motion to preclude the introduction of any statements of defendant and/or identification evidence not noticed pursuant to CPL §710.30 is denied with leave to renew at a time when the People seek to use any such evidence.

MOTION FOR A SANDOVAL AND VENTIMIGLIA HEARING

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that a hearing is hereby ordered which will be held to determine which, if any, bad acts or convictions may be used as impeachment in the event that the defendant elects to testify at trial. The Court will also order a hearing to determine, which, if any, bad acts or convictions may be used as evidence in the People's direct case. The District Attorney is ordered to disclose, in accordance with CPL Section 240.43, any and all acts which he intends to use for purposes of impeaching defendant at trial, as well as any and all acts and/or convictions to be presented as evidence in chief.

MOTION TO SUPPRESS IDENTIFICATION

Defendant's motion is granted to the extent that a bifurcated hearing is hereby ordered to determine the admissibility of any identification evidence. CPL 710.60(4) and People v. Chipp, 75 NY2d 327 (1990).

MOTION TO SUPPRESS PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

Defendant's motion to suppress physical evidence is denied based upon the People's representation that no physical evidence was seized from defendant.

HEARINGS IN ADVANCE OF TRIAL

Pre-trial hearings will be scheduled and conducted in a manner consistent with the rights of the defendant and in the interests of judicial economy.

MOTION FOR RESERVATION OF FURTHER MOTIONS

CPL Section 255.20 provides defendant with the procedure to make further motions. No order of the Court is necessary at this time.

CONFERENCE/HEARING DATE

This matter is scheduled for a pre-trial hearing to be held on October 16, 2017. All parties are directed to be present.

The foregoing constitutes the Decision and Order of the Court.

Dated: Goshen, New York
October 12, 2017

E N T E R.


HON. NICHOLAS DE ROSA
COUNTY COURT JUDGE

[* 5]

TO: DAVID M. HOOVLER, ESQ.
ORANGE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Attorney for the People
40 Matthews Street
Goshen, New York 10924

ANTHONY C. CILLIS, ESQ.
JONNA SPILBOR LAW
Attorneys for the Defendant
214 Main Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601