STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF MOORE

GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION FILE NO. 15 CRS 520

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)	
)	
VS.)	
)	TRANSCRIPT OF
DAMIEN OMAR SULLIVAN,)	
)	BENCH TRIAL
Defendant.)	
)	

FEBRUARY 2 AND 4, 2016

Transcript of bench trial in the General Court of Justice, Superior Court Division, held in Moore County, Carthage, North Carolina, commencing during the Criminal Session, before the Honorable Kenneth F. Crow, Judge presiding.

APPEARANCES:

CRAIG SLAGLE
Assistant District Attorney
P. O. Box 429
Carthage, NC 28327
Craig.A.Slagle@nccourts.org
On behalf of the State

Stephan Lapping
Attorney at Law
105 East Barrett Street
Carthage, NC 28327
On behalf of the Defendant

(The case of the State of North Carolina versus

this matter up for hearing on Thursday morning. 1 2 Have I stated it correctly, gentlemen? 3 MR. LAPPING: Yes, Your Honor. 4 MR. SLAGLE: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: And it's appropriate -- excuse me -- if appropriate the Court will entertain those stipulated facts 6 7 and then maybe rule on any pretrial motions. Is that correct, gentlemen? 8 9 MR. LAPPING: Yes, sir. MR. SLAGLE: Yes, sir. 10 11 THE COURT: Very well. We'll set this matter for hearing Thursday morning at 9:30. Mr. Slagle, I understand 12 13 you got other matters set up for about 11:00 o'clock so do you have any objection if we push this matter to 9:30 in the 14 morning and deal with this first? 15 MR. SLAGLE: No. 16 17 THE COURT: Mr. Lapping? MR. LAPPING: That would be fine, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: 9:30 Thursday morning. 19 20 MR. SLAGLE: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings adjourned at 2:32 p.m.) 21 22 23

24

(The case of the State of North Carolina versus DAMIEN OMAR SULLIVAN, Moore County case 15 CRS 520, was called for hearing on February 4, 2016 at 10:11 a.m. The defendant and counsel were present.)

THE COURT: Whenever y'all are ready.

MR. SLAGLE: Your Honor please, next matter, this comes from the trial calendar, page 33, line 33, Your Honor, Damien Sullivan. He is present in the courtroom with his attorney, Mr. Lapping.

Your Honor, this was going to be the next matter State would call for trial this term. The defendant did file a written waiver of his right to a jury trial which I believe was provided to the Court.

THE COURT: He has. We've made the findings wherein the defendant understands that he has a right to have a jury trial with 12 folks sitting in judgment, and that the judgment would have to be unanimous before they could convict him.

Mr. Lapping has gone over that with him, and the Court received the form, I believe it was Tuesday, we got it on Tuesday and we put the finding on the record that the defendant had knowingly, intelligently waived his right to a jury trial.

MR. SLAGLE: Yes, sir. This morning Mr. Lapping,

myself and the defendant all signed what is titled

"Stipulation" under 15 CRS 0520. I believe it should have

made a copy to the Court file at this time.

MR. LAPPING: Your Honor, I have an extra copy if the Court needs it.

THE COURT: Ms. Cynthia, can you take about a five minute break while I read this material?

We're off the record.

(Recess from 10:13 a.m. to 10:18 a.m.)

THE COURT: Ms. Cynthia, we're back on the record.

The parties have asked the Court to take care of a couple matters pretrial. They had contemplated the same when we adjourned on Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. Lapping had indicated that he was going to be filing an oral motion to dismiss the charges, and that even in the light most favorable to the State there was simply no element of intent present here, and inasmuch as there was no intent, and the State could not prove the same, that that would be a fatal flaw to the State being able to secure a conviction for voter fraud, which does in fact contain the element of intent, namely, that the defendant intended to act in a fraudulent fashion. So Mr. Lapping has made his oral motion to dismiss.

To the credit of the parties, they have been able to reduce some facts down to stipulation, and they have

styled up a document titled "Stipulation," which details seven facts that the parties have agreed are not in controversy, and they are these, Ms. Cynthia.

The Court will hand the stipulation to the court reporter to allow her to enter them into the record.

(The following was entered by the court reporter using the document titled "Stipulation":)

At the time of the alleged offense defendant was a citizen of Jamaica, living in Moore County, North Carolina, on a valid K3 visa.

In 2005 while residing in Aberdeen,
North Carolina, defendant applied for a
North Carolina driver's license at the
Aberdeen office of the North Carolina
Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

Defendant presented his official

Jamaican passport as identification to

officials at DMV and gave his place of birth

as Kingston, Jamaica.

The DMV official processing defendant's license application asked defendant if he wished to register to vote, and defendant replied affirmatively.

4	Jamaica.
5	On April 26, 2011, the Moore County
6	Board of Elections canceled defendant's
7	voter registration and notified defendant by
8	mail of the cancellation.
9	Defendant was interviewed by the
10	investigator for the Moore County District
11	Attorney on or about March 24, 2015, and
12	gave a voluntary statement admitting the
13	foregoing facts.
14	THE COURT: The Court has given the stipulation with
15	the seven stipulated facts to the court reporter. She's
16	entered the same into the record.
17	The Court has read them. I've also read the
18	statute. I've read the indictment.
19	Mr. Lapping, it's your oral motion. I'll hear
20	you, sir, as to why the Court should dismiss this case before
21	the Court starts taking additional evidence.
22	MR. LAPPING: Thank you, Your Honor. I think this
23	matter turns certainly on the element included in
24	G.S.163-275(7), the statute that underlies this indictment,
25	that states: "For any person with the intent to commit a
1	

Defendant voted on May 6, 2008, and

November 8, 2008, in Moore County, at which

time defendant was still a citizen of

1

2

fraud," and in this -- in this particular case it would be the last section, "to vote illegally at any primary or election."

I don't think there's any dispute with regard to the facts that Mr. Sullivan did in fact vote twice in 2008, and I don't think there's any dispute that as a citizen of the country of Jamaica as opposed to the United States that he was not eligible to vote.

However, I don't believe the State has any evidence with regard to the -- to Mr. Sullivan making a false representation or concealing any material fact, either past or existing, which would be a requirement to prove fraud.

I think with regard to misrepresentation, the undisputed facts are that he presented to the official of the Department of Motor Vehicles an official Jamaican passport which identifies him as a Jamaican citizen, and that in that process of applying for driver's license with DMV indicated that he was born in Kingston, Jamaica.

So certainly no mis -- evidence of misrepresentation of his citizenship status or that he concealed in fact with regard to the uncontroverted, undisputed evidence, he did not conceal and clearly disclosed the fact that he was a Jamaican citizen at the time, and that -- that he was born there and was not a United States citizen.

4 5

So we say the State has no evidence with regard to any intent to commit a fraud as fraud would be defined under North Carolina law.

Without the ability to prove that intent, Your Honor, we would say the State cannot, in the light most favorable to the State, that these facts do not support a charge that Mr. Sullivan with the intent to commit a fraud illegally voted, and move the Court to dismiss this.

THE COURT: I've received as Defendant's Exhibit

Number 1 a copy of the statute. Mr. Lapping has taken the

liberty to highlight the pertinent provision under

subparagraph (7) there which indicates, "for any person

with," highlighted, "intent to commit a fraud." So I've

received that.

Do you care to be heard further on your motion, sir?

MR. LAPPING: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Slagle, first of all I commend you for allowing Mr. Lapping to make this motion orally, accepting notice, agreeing to be heard. I also commend you for allowing the stipulation which clearly streamlines the business before the Court.

I will certainly hear you in your comments --

MR. SLAGLE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: -- in opposition of motion to dismiss.

MR. SLAGLE: If Your Honor please, I just want to make sure one thing is clear. Mr. Lapping indicated in his soliloquy that defendant voted twice in 2008. I want to be clear for the record the stipulation and the indictment both state that he voted in the primary election, May 6, 2008, and then again the general election, November 4, 2008. There was no allegation he voted twice in one single election.

Your Honor, State would ask that you deny the motion at this stage. We have agreed to a stipulation of the facts. I will not tell the Court that the State would put on any witnesses or any other evidence that would not track what's in the seven paragraphs of the stipulation.

Mowever, the State would ask the Court deny the motion for the fact that the Court knows seldom is there direct evidence of intent in any case. It's a question for the finder of fact, which in this matter of course would be Your Honor, but the State would ask that Your Honor look at the evidence and stipulation in the light most favorable to the State and deny the defendant's motion at this stage of proceeding, Judge.

Don't wish to be heard any further than that.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Slagle. Mr. Slagle, since this is a bench trial, since I'm already satisfied you exercise a good deal of discretion, and you do it appropriately in my dealings with you this week, I've been

able to form my opinion.

Can you proffer to the Court what your evidence would be of intent, other than the fact that the gentleman presented himself to DMV to get a driver's license --

MR. SLAGLE: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: -- and then unsolicited was asked if he wanted to register to vote. He did. He voted in the primary, as he thought he should be able to do. He voted in the general, as he thought he should be able to do. Was then notified not to vote anymore, and he did not vote anymore, yet he was charged and indicted with voter fraud.

And so I understand the situation that you're in. Clearly even in the light most favorable to you, those are not favorable facts to prosecute for fraud, but nevertheless, unfavorable facts does not necessarily equate to a dismissal.

So what I'm looking for now, if you don't mind, sir, is an oral presentation by the prosecutor in way of a proffer as to what the evidence would be as to the defendant's intent to act fraudulently.

MR. SLAGLE: Your Honor, with the exception of what's in the stipulation, those seven paragraphs, as I stand here before you I cannot tell the Court that the State would have any additional witnesses or physical evidence of intent on behalf of Mr. Sullivan.

2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

THE COURT: Okay. Then the Court would find that based on these stipulated facts, the statements from Counsel, the embellished argument from Mr. Lapping, and the informal proffer from the prosecutor, that it would be an exercise in futility for the Court to be able to hear evidence in this matter and then make findings that the State has been able to prove each and every element of this offense, especially beyond a reasonable doubt, most pertinent as to element of intent.

I commend the prosecutor. A lot of prosecutors sometimes get lost in seeking convictions as opposed to justice. This one did not. He was candid with the Court, forthcoming. He had a duty to prosecute and prosecute zealously on behalf of the State. I feel that he has done so.

I also feel that he did not want to jeopardize his credibility with the Court, was truthful, candid and forthcoming. Sometimes a prosecutor's job is to seek justice as much as convictions. I think you've done that.

 $\label{eq:motion_motion} \text{Most respectfully the Court would allow the}$ motion from Mr. Lapping to dismiss the charge.

Mr. Lapping, I will have the clerk prepare just a simple, what is it, a 600 form? 601 form? Okay. You see how close I was. Okay. The 305 form which dismisses the charge.

1	Would you submit your fee application to the
2	Court, please, sir?
3	MR. LAPPING: I will, Your Honor. Thank you.
4	THE COURT: Anything else folks?
5	MR. SLAGLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you very much.
6	MR. LAPPING: Thank you very much.
7	THE COURT: Have a good day, sir.
8	(Proceedings concluded at 10:29 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings taken at the February 2, 2016, Session of the Moore County Superior Court is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings taken by me and transcribed by me. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This the 22nd day of March, 2016.

CYNTERIA L. HALL, RPR

Official Court Reporter 19D