

**People v Davis**

2018 NY Slip Op 33515(U)

April 13, 2018

County Court, Westchester County

Docket Number: 16-1059-01

Judge: George E. Fufidio

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

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

COUNTY COURT: STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

-----X  
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

-against-

RICCO DAVIS, DISHAWN TERRY  
and JALIN WILLIAMS

Defendant. APR 13 2018

**FILED**

DECISION & ORDER  
Indictment No.: 16-1059-01

-----X  
FUFIDIO, J.

TIMOTHY C. IDONI  
COUNTY CLERK  
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

Defendant, RICCO DAVIS, having been indicted on or about December 7, 2017 on one count of robbery in the second degree (Penal Law § 160.10[1]) and one count of petit larceny (Penal Law § 155.25) has filed an omnibus motion which consists of a Notice of Motion, an Affirmation in Support and a Memorandum of Law. In response, the People have filed an Affirmation in Opposition together with a Memorandum of Law. Upon consideration of these papers, the stenographic transcript of the grand jury minutes and the Consent Discovery Order entered in this case, this Court disposes of this motion as follows:

A & B MOTION TO INSPECT, DISMISS AND/OR REDUCE

The court grants the defendant’s motion to the limited extent that the court has conducted, with the consent of the People, an *in camera* inspection of the stenographic transcription of the grand jury proceedings. Upon such review, the court finds no basis upon which to grant defendant’s application to dismiss or reduce the indictment.

The grand jury was properly instructed (*see People v Calbud*, 49 NY2d 389 [1980]; *People v Valles*, 62 NY2d 36 [1984]; *People v Burch*, 108 AD3d 679 [2d Dept 2013]). The evidence presented, if accepted as true, is legally sufficient to establish every element of each offense charged (CPL 210.30[2]). “Courts assessing the sufficiency of the evidence before a grand jury must evaluate whether the evidence, viewed most favorably to the People, if unexplained and uncontradicted--and deferring all questions as to the weight or quality of the evidence--would warrant conviction” (*People v Mills*, 1 NY3d 269, 274-275 [2002]). Legally sufficient evidence means competent evidence which, if accepted as true, would establish every element of an offense charged and the defendant’s commission thereof (CPL 70.10[1]; *see People v Flowers*, 138 AD3d 1138, 1139 [2d Dept 2016]). “In the context of a Grand Jury proceeding, legal sufficiency means prima facie proof of the crimes charged, not proof beyond a reasonable doubt” (*People v Jessup*, 90 AD3d 782, 783 [2d Dept 2011]). “The reviewing court’s inquiry is limited to whether the facts, if proven, and the inferences that logically flow from those facts supply proof of every element of the charged crimes, and whether the Grand Jury could rationally have drawn the guilty inference. That other, innocent inferences could possibly be drawn from those facts is irrelevant to the sufficiency inquiry as long as the Grand Jury could rationally have drawn the guilty inference” (*People v Bello*, 92 NY2d 523, 526 [1998]).

Additionally, the minutes reveal a quorum of the grand jurors was present during the presentation

of evidence, that the Assistant District Attorney properly instructed the grand jury on the law, and only permitted those grand jurors who heard all the evidence to vote the matter.

Based upon the *in camera* review, since this court does not find release of the grand jury minutes or any portion thereof necessary to assist it in making any determinations and as the defendant has not set forth a compelling or particularized need for the production of the grand jury minutes, defendant's application for a copy of the grand jury minutes is denied (*People v Jang*, 17 AD3d 693 [2d Dept 2005]; CPL 190.25[4][a]).

Furthermore, the portion of the defendant's motion requesting dismissal of the indictment for facial insufficiency under CPL 200.50(7)(a) is also denied. The indictment contains a plain and concise factual statement in each count which, without allegations of an evidentiary nature, asserts facts supporting every element of the offense charged and the defendant's commission thereof with sufficient precision as to clearly apprise the defendant of the conduct which is the subject of the indictment (CPL 200.50). In reading the language of the indictment on its own and in conjunction with the bill of particulars given to the defendant in consent discovery, it is clear that the indictment charges each and every element of the crimes and further meets the requirement that the defendant be given notice of the charges against him with respect to the time, place and manner in which the People allege the crimes were committed (*People v Albanese*, 45 AD3d 691 [2d Dept 2007], *People v Iannone*, 45 NY2d 589 [1978]).

#### C. MOTION FOR DISCOVERY, DISCLOSURE AND INSPECTION CPL ARTICLE 240

The parties have entered into a stipulation by way of a Consent Discovery Order consenting to the enumerated discovery in this case. Defendant's motion for discovery is granted to the extent provided for in Criminal Procedure Law Article 240. If there any further items discoverable pursuant to Criminal Procedure Law Article 240 which have not been provided to defendant pursuant to the Consent Discovery Order, they are to be provided forthwith.

As to the defendant's demand for exculpatory material, the People have acknowledged their continuing duty to disclose exculpatory material at the earliest possible date upon its discovery (*see, Brady v Maryland*, 373 US 83 [1963]; *Giglio v United States*, 405 US 150 [1972]). In the event that the People are, or become, aware of any material which is arguably exculpatory and they are not willing to consent to its disclosure to the defendant, they are directed to immediately disclose such material to the court to permit an *in camera* inspection and determination as to whether the material must be disclosed to the defendant.

Except to the extent that the defendant's application has been specifically granted herein, it is otherwise denied as seeking material or information beyond the scope of discovery (*see, People v Colavito*, 87 NY2d 423 [1996]; *Matter of Brown v Grosso*, 285 AD2d 642 [2d Dept 2001]; *Matter of Brown v Appelman*, 241 AD2d 279 [2d Dept 1998]; *Matter of Catterson v Jones*, 229 AD2d 435 [2d Dept 1996]; *Matter of Catterson v Rohl*, 202 AD2d 420 [2d Dept 1994]).

#### D. MOTION FOR SANDOVAL AND VENTIMIGLIA HEARINGS

Defendant has moved for a pre-trial hearing to permit the trial court to determine the extent, if at all, to which the People may inquire into the defendant's prior criminal convictions, prior uncharged criminal act, and vicious or immoral conduct (see, *People v Sandoval*, 34 NY2d 371 [1974]). The People have consented to, and it is now ordered that immediately prior to trial the court will conduct a *Sandoval* hearing.

At the hearing, the People are required to notify the defendant of all specific instances of his criminal, prior uncharged criminal acts and vicious or immoral conduct of which they have knowledge and which they intend to use in an attempt to impeach the defendant's credibility if he elects to testify at trial (CPL 240.43). The defendant shall then bear the burden of identifying any instances of his prior misconduct that he submits the People should not be permitted to use to impeach his credibility. The defendant shall be required to identify the basis of his belief that each event or incident may be unduly prejudicial to him should he decide testify as a witness on his own behalf and thereby prevent him from exercising this right (see, *People v Matthews*, 68 NY2d 118 [1986]; *People v Malphurs*, 111 AD2d 266 [2d Dept 1985]).

Defendant's application for a *Ventimiglia* hearing is denied as premature, because the People have not indicated an intention to use any evidence of prior bad act or uncharged crimes of the defendant in its case in chief (see, *People v Molineaux*, 168 NY2d 264 [1991]; *People v Ventimiglia*, 52 NY2d 350 [1981]). The People have stated that if they do intend to use any *Molineaux* evidence that they will inform the defense and the court of their intention and at that point the defendant may renew this aspect of his motion.

#### E. MOTION TO STRIKE PREJUDICIAL LANGUAGE

The defendant moves to strike certain language from the indictment on the grounds that it is surplusage, irrelevant or prejudicial. The language concluding the indictment merely identifies the defendant's acts as public, rather than private wrongs and such language should not be stricken as prejudicial. This motion is denied (see, *People v Gill*, 164 AD2d 867 [2d Dept 1990]; *People v Winters*, 194 AD2d 703 [2d Dept 1993]; *People v Garcia*, 170 Misc. 2d 543 [Westchester Co. Ct. 1996]).

#### F. MOTION TO STRIKE STATEMENT AND IDENTIFICATION NOTICES CPL ARTICLE 710

The motion to strike is denied. Said notices are in conformity with the statutory requirements of CPL 710.30.

#### G. MOTION to SUPPRESS IDENTIFICATION TESTIMONY CPL ARTICLE 710

This motion is granted to the extent that a hearing shall be held to consider whether or not the noticed identifications were unduly suggestive (*United States v Wade*, 388 US 218 [1967]). Specifically, the court shall determine whether the identifications were so improperly suggestive as to taint any in-court identification. In the event the identifications are found to be unduly suggestive, the court shall then go on to consider whether the People have proven by clear and convincing evidence that an independent source exists for such witness' proposed in-court identification.

#### H. MOTION TO SUPPRESS NOTICED STATEMENTS

This branch of the Defendant's motion seeking to suppress statements on the grounds that they were unconstitutionally obtained is granted to the extent that a *Huntley* hearing shall be held prior to trial to determine whether any statements allegedly made by the Defendant, which have been noticed by the People pursuant to CPL 710.30 (1)(a) were involuntarily made by the Defendant within the meaning of CPL 60.45 (see CPL 710.20 (3); CPL 710.60 [3][b]; *People v Weaver*, 49 NY2d 1012 [1980]), obtained in violation of Defendant's Sixth Amendment right to counsel, and/or obtained in violation of the Defendant's Fourth Amendment rights (see *Dunaway v New York*, 442 US 200 [1979]).

#### I. MOTION TO PRECLUDE STATEMENTS NOT NOTICED

Defendant's application to preclude statements not noticed is denied as premature. Should the People introduce statements made by the Defendant that were not noticed then the defendant may renew this aspect of his motion.

#### J. MOTION TO STRIKE ALIBI NOTICE

The Defendant's motion to strike the alibi notice is denied. Contrary to the Defendant's contentions, it is well-settled that CPL 250.00 is indeed in compliance with the constitutional requirements (see *People v Dawson*, 185 AD2d 854 [2d Dept 1992]; *People v Cruz*, 176 AD2d 751 [2d Dept 1991]; *People v Gill*, 164 AD2d 867 [2d Dept 1990]) and provides equality in the required disclosure (*People v Peterson*, 96 AD2d 871 [2d Dept 1983]; see generally *Wardius v Oregon*, 412 US 470 [1973]).

#### K. MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF GIGLIO MATERIAL

The People recognize their duty to disclose exculpatory material, in particular any agreement between the People and any prosecution witness, at the earliest possible date (see *Brady v Maryland*, 373 US 83 [1963]; *Giglio v United States*, 405 US 150 [1972]) and will do so if the situation arises.

#### L. MOTION FOR SEVERANCE

When charges against co-defendants are properly joined in a single indictment, motions for separate trials are addressed to the discretion of the trial court (see *People v Mahboubian*, 74 NY2d 174, 183 [1989]). When such a motion is made, "severance is compelled where the core of each defense is in irreconcilable conflict with the other and where there is a significant danger, as both defenses are portrayed to the trial court, that the conflict alone would lead the jury to infer defendant's guilt" (*People v Mahboubian*, 74 NY2d at 184). Inasmuch as the defenses asserted by the defendant and the co-defendants are not in irreconcilable conflict with each other such that there is a danger that the conflict alone would lead a jury to infer the defendant's guilt, his motion to sever is denied (see *People v Terry*, 78 AD3d 1207 [2d Dept 2010]).


The defendant was properly joined in the same indictment (CPL 200.40[1]). The Court may, however, for good cause shown order that defendant be tried separately. Good cause includes a showing

that defendant would be “unduly prejudiced by a joint trial” (CPL 200.40[1]). Further, where the proof against all defendants is supplied by the same evidence, “only the most cogent reasons warrant a severance” (*People v Bornholdt*, 33 NY2d 75, 87 [1973]; *People v Kevin Watts*, 159 AD2d 740 [2d Dept 1990]). And, “. . . a strong public policy favors joinder, because it expedites the judicial process, reduces court congestion, and avoids the necessity of recalling witnesses. . .” (*People v Mahboubian*, 74 NY2d 174, 183 [1989]).

Defendant’s motion to sever on the grounds of potential prejudice arising from a *Sandoval* ruling is denied as premature. The Defendant may renew the motion after a *Sandoval* ruling, and upon a showing that a joint trial will result in unfair prejudice to him and substantially impair his defense. This court must determine whether the co-defendants’ statements are admissible and if so, if it is possible to redact the co-defendants’ statements and whether the co-defendants will be testifying at trial. Accordingly, the defendant’s motion for a severance is denied as premature, with leave to renew upon a determination of the admissibility of co-defendants’ alleged statements, and upon a showing that a joint trial will result in unfair prejudice to him and substantially impair his defense. Notably, a limiting instruction at trial would properly direct the jury to separately consider the proof as to each crime charged, thereby eliminating any prejudice to the defendant (*see People v Veeny*, 215 AD2d 605 [2d Dept 1995]).

The foregoing constitutes the opinion, decision and order of this Court.

Dated: White Plains, New York  
April 13, 2018

  
Honorable George E. Ruffino  
Westchester County Court Justice

To:

HON. ANTHONY A. SCARPINO, JR.  
District Attorney, Westchester County  
111 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
White Plains, New York 10601

BY:

VIRGINIA A. MARCIANO, ESQ.  
Assistant District Attorney

MARIA I. WAGER, ESQ.  
Assistant District Attorney

RICHARD L. FERRANTE  
399 Knollwood Road, Suite 111  
White Plains, New York 10603