

ANNUAL REPORT



2016

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.....	12
CIVIL REMEDIES UNIT.....	13
CRIME SCENE UNIT.....	15
EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT.....	16
FAMILY UNIT.....	17
FINANCIAL CRIMES UNIT.....	17
GANG, GUN AND NARCOTICS TASK FORCE.....	19
GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT.....	23
HIGH-TECH CRIMES/FORENSIC UNIT.....	24
HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT.....	28
INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT.....	29
INSURANCE FRAUD UNIT.....	29
INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT.....	30
MAJOR CRIMES UNIT.....	31
PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT.....	33
SEXUAL ASSAULT/CHILD ABUSE UNIT.....	34
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.....	35
TRIAL UNIT.....	36
OFFICE OF VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCACY.....	38
STATISTICAL DATA.....	41

TRANSITION TO PRESENT BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR

The year 2016 marked the last full year that Robert D. Bernardi served as the Burlington County Prosecutor. Former Prosecutor Bernardi was first nominated by Governor Christine Todd Whitman and took office on June 23, 1999, and served through and beyond two more five-year terms.

On November 10, 2011, Prosecutor Bernardi was nominated to serve a third five-year term by Governor Christopher J. Christie. He was administered the oath of office on December 18, 2011.

Prosecutor Bernardi was succeeded as Burlington County Prosecutor by Scott A. Coffina, who was nominated by Governor Christie and sworn in on March 31, 2017 after confirmation by the New Jersey Senate. He served as Gov. Christie's Senior Deputy Chief Counsel prior to becoming Prosecutor.

During remarks for the swearing-in of Prosecutor Coffina, Governor Christie told the crowd that Scott was highly respected during his time working in the New Jersey State House because he was known as someone who would advocate for decisions to be made based on right and wrong, regardless of the political implications.

"In Scott Coffina, I can tell you that you have someone with unquestionable integrity," Governor Christie said.

PROSECUTOR COFFINA'S MESSAGE

I am honored and humbled by the opportunity to serve my fellow residents of Burlington County, and to lead the outstanding men and women who work in the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office. I look forward to working with local police departments throughout our County, the State Police, our county Freeholders, and community leaders. This is a challenging time for the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office, with a recent spike in gun crime, the opioid epidemic that has touched everyone in our county in one way or another, and the implementation of criminal justice reform, among other challenges.

Mindful of these issues, my top priorities for the BCPO will be:

- (1) Combatting the opioid epidemic that has plagued our County, state and nation, through pro-active investigations and prosecutions of illegal drug distribution, aggressive prosecution of drug-induced-death, strict liability homicide cases, and working with our Freeholders and partners in the law enforcement and treatment communities to enhance opportunities for non-violent offenders struggling with addiction to find their way to treatment;

- (2) Fighting gun crime, working closely with our law enforcement partners throughout the County;
- (3) Victim and witness protection, building on the strong tradition of this Office in supporting crime victims and advocating for their interests through our prosecutions of offenders, and protecting brave men and women who come forward to cooperate with law enforcement to make our communities safer;
- (4) Enhanced community engagement, building positive relationships and trust with community leaders, clergy, business leaders, school leaders, community groups and others working to make Burlington County the great place it is to live and raise a family; and
- (5) Professional development and retention of our staff, working with the dedicated public servants of the BCPO to help them find fulfillment in the work they are performing on behalf of our fellow residents, and to reach their full potential as law enforcement professionals.

I am very excited about the future of the BCPO and the many opportunities this position brings to enhance public safety. Please visit our Facebook page often for information about our investigations, prosecutions, community activities, and the great work of our law enforcement partners in Burlington County.

BURLINGTON COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

THE COUNTY

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

THE PROSECUTOR

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

THE OFFICE

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office (BCPO) is funded by the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders and during 2016 employed 128 people. The staff includes 36 attorneys, 38 investigators, 12 prosecutor's agents, 27 secretarial representatives, seven victim-witness advocates, one coordinator of nurse examiners (SART/SANE), one confidential aid, one county victim witness coordinator and five legal assistants. The BCPO also utilizes up to seven volunteer legal interns.

ATTORNEYS

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

INVESTIGATORS

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

PROSECUTOR'S AGENTS

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

COUNTY VICTIM WITNESS COORDINATOR

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

VICTIM WITNESS ADVOCATES

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

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

CLERICAL STAFF

Clerical personnel play an integral role in the operation of the Office. They are responsible for all of the correspondence, filing and record keeping. They also provide critical support for assembling and producing discovery, for 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 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 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 recommendations 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 for PTI appeals, or when the State appeals the decision of the Superior Court judge 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 asserts our position on expungement. Briefs and oral arguments are required when objections to the expungement application are raised by the prosecutor.

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2016

Ronald Burns v. Charles Warren, et al.

On the evening of September 6, 1999, Tony Felder, acting on the defendant's instructions, shot and killed Ronald Patterson Jr., in Mount Holly. The defendant was convicted in 2002 of first-degree Murder, second-degree Possession of a Weapon for

Unlawful Purpose, and Hindering Apprehension. After exhausting his state court remedies, the defendant filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

In his petition, the defendant alleged that the New Jersey state courts had erroneously rejected claims of prejudice and violations of the New Jersey and United States constitutions on appeal and on motions for post-conviction relief. The defendant alleged that a total of 16 different errors at trial warranted reversal of his conviction, including allegations that he was deprived of a fair trial when a State's witness expressed before the jury that he refused to answer certain questions posed by the prosecutor; that the State committed prosecutorial misconduct by calling the witness when it knew that the witness was hesitant to testify; that he was prejudiced by the jury instructions given at trial; and that he was prejudiced by the court's refusal to remove certain jurors from the panel for cause. On March 22, 2016, the District Court concluded that the state courts' decisions denying defendant's claims of error were not contrary to, nor were unreasonable applications of law, and that defendant was not entitled to federal court relief.

State v. Shannon Sidorek

On February 28, 2012, the defendant, who was under the influence of multiple controlled dangerous substances, including Oxycodone and Xanax, caused a two-car motor vehicle collision in Pemberton Township that resulted in the death of 81-year-old Elizabeth Smith. The defendant's blood was drawn without a search warrant at the request of the New Jersey State Police, while she was being treated at a hospital in Trenton, after a sergeant entered her vehicle at the scene of the crash to search for identifying credentials and found pill bottles in her purse. One of the pill bottles was ultimately found to contain Oxycodone.

The defendant moved to suppress the results of the blood draw, the pill bottles, and the contents of the bottles, alleging that the sergeant's entry into the passenger compartment of her vehicle and his search of the purse violated her constitutional rights. The Superior Court, Law Division, granted the defendant's motion to suppress the bottles, pills contained therein, and the blood draw. The State appealed, and on October 7, 2014, the Superior Court Appellate Division reversed the trial court's suppression of the pill bottles, the oxycodone contained therein, and her blood, concluding that the sergeant's actions in entering defendant's vehicle to search for her credentials and identifying information were objectively reasonable in light of the facts known to him at the time of the search.

The defendant appealed to the New Jersey Supreme Court. On March 14, 2016, the Supreme Court summarily remanded the matter to the Appellate Division for reconsideration in light of State v. Adkins, 221 N.J. 300 (2015) and State v. Keaton, 222 N.J. 438 (2015). On April 15, 2016, the Appellate Division again reversed the trial court's decision suppressing the seizure of defendant's purse, the bottles of medication it contained and the contents of those bottles. The court remanded the matter to the trial

court for additional testimony regarding the blood draw, which the trial court ultimately concluded was admissible.

State v. Boyce Singleton

On September 13, 2005, the defendant shot his pregnant girlfriend, Michelle Cazan four times, then stabbed her four times with a butterfly knife. The knife wounds to Michelle proved fatal. The day before Michelle's death, she told the defendant she was pregnant with his child. In 2008, the defendant was convicted at trial of first-degree Murder, second-degree Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose, third-degree Possession of a Weapon for an Unlawful Purpose, third-degree Unlawful Possession of a Weapon, third-degree Hindering Apprehension, and fourth-degree Tampering with Physical Evidence.

The defendant appealed, and the Appellate Division reversed his conviction based upon an alleged deficiency with a jury instruction on the defendant's proffered defense of insanity. The State petitioned for certification to the New Jersey Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court reversed the Appellate Division decision and remanded the matter to the Appellate Division, which rejected the defendant's remaining claims.

In 2013, the defendant filed a motion for post-conviction relief in the Law Division, alleging that trial counsel was ineffective for failing to call a witness at trial and for failing to pursue a defense at trial by attacking the State's expert witness regarding his examination of the defendant and trial testimony that the defendant was able to understand that what he was doing was wrong when he shot and stabbed Michelle. The trial court denied the defendant's motion for post-conviction relief, holding that trial counsel effectively represented the defendant and that counsel's decision not to call the witness or attack the testimony of the State's witness at trial did not prejudice the defendant. The defendant appealed from the denial of his motion. On October 12, 2016, the Superior Court, Law Division, concluded that the trial court had correctly rejected the defendant's claims of ineffective assistance of counsel and denied his appeal in its entirety.

State v. Hassan Jones

On May 8, 2011, the defendant physically and sexually assaulted H.N., his intermittent paramour of 10 years. When H.N. returned to her residence after work that night, the defendant was inside. H.N. placed a voice recorder in a pocket of her pants to record their interactions because she was aware of the defendant's history of unpredictable behavior. H.N. told the defendant she no longer wished to have a sexual relationship with him and refused his advances. The defendant demanded that H.N. engage in sexual intercourse. When she refused, the defendant began threatening her life, stating he would kill her, burn down her house, and damage her career and family. The defendant choked H.N., slapped her in the face, and held her down on a mattress. The

defendant demanded that H.N. remove her clothes, and he had intercourse with her against her will. H.N. repeatedly asked the defendant to stop.

In 2012, the defendant was convicted at trial of second-degree Sexual Assault, third-degree Criminal Restraint, third-degree Aggravated Assault, and third-degree Terroristic Threats. The defendant was sentenced to 10 years in New Jersey state prison (85% to be served without the possibility of parole), as well as three concurrent five-year state prison sentences. The defendant did not pursue a direct appeal. In 2015, however, he filed a motion for post-conviction relief in the Superior Court, Law Division. The defendant alleged that trial counsel was ineffective for several reasons. The Law Division determined that an evidentiary hearing was necessary to resolve two of the defendant's claims, and conducted a hearing on September 30, 2016. Specifically, the court considered the defendant's claim that trial counsel was ineffective for failing to call witnesses who would have testified that the victim was angry about his infidelity and wanted to hurt his reputation and his claim that counsel was ineffective for failing to investigate alleged prior false accusations of domestic violence against the defendant. After considering the testimony adduced at the hearing and the arguments of counsel, the court denied all of the defendant's claims on motion for post-conviction relief on November 30, 2016.

State v. Lenroy Laurance

On September 2, 2009, the defendant and co-defendants Robby White and Kareem Harrison decided to commit a carjacking or robbery in Philadelphia. They armed themselves with handguns and hunted for a victim. They encountered victim Lyudmila Burshteyn while she was sitting in her vehicle, pointed their handguns at her, and entered her vehicle. The defendant stole \$1,000 from the victim's purse, and Willis hit the victim in the face with a handgun, injuring her.

The defendant, Willis and Harrison began driving the victim's vehicle while holding her captive and went back to their residence, where they picked up co-defendant Marcus White. The defendant and his co-defendants drove the vehicle, containing the bound and blindfolded victim, into New Jersey to search for weapons they had discarded earlier in the week. When they were unable to find the handguns, they decided to kill the victim and sell her vehicle to a "chop shop." They drove the victim's vehicle to a rural road in Mansfield Township and removed the victim from her vehicle. The defendant told her she was "home," walked her into a field, and shot her in the neck. The defendant and co-defendants fled the area, leaving the victim to die from her wound.

The defendant and his co-defendants fled New Jersey, and were apprehended driving the victim's vehicle in South Carolina. The defendant was convicted of nine counts at trial, including first-degree Murder, first-degree Carjacking, first-degree Kidnapping, second-degree Possession of a Weapon for Unlawful Purpose, and third-degree Terroristic Threats. The defendant was sentenced to life in New Jersey state prison

plus 40 years (85% to be served without the possibility of parole). The defendant appealed his conviction and sentence, which were upheld.

The defendant then filed a motion for post-conviction relief in the Law Division in November 2015, alleging that trial counsel was ineffective for failing to object to jury instructions regarding co-conspirator liability, and that counsel was ineffective for failing to investigate a potential witness who could have testified on his behalf at trial. After considering the submissions of the parties and the arguments of counsel, the court concluded that the defendant had failed to demonstrate that counsel's representation was ineffective or that the defendant was prejudiced by counsel's failure to object to the jury instructions or failure to investigate the alleged witness. The trial court thus denied the defendant's motion without conducting an evidentiary hearing, holding that a hearing was not needed to resolve his claims.

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). The CAR Unit is supervised by an assistant prosecutor and operations are carried out via the MCU chain of command. MCU personnel are responsible for assisting the supervising assistant prosecutor with the investigation of CAR Unit cases and preparing those cases for trial. A Victim Witness Advocate is responsible for victim outreach.

In 2016, the CAR Unit investigated 129 fatal and serious motor vehicle crashes during the calendar year. Criminal charges, including Vehicular Homicide, Assault by Auto, Causing Death or Serious Injury While Suspended and Leaving the Scene of a Fatal/Serious Motor Vehicle Crash were filed in 19 cases.

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2016

State v. Jose Rentas

On July 4, 2015, Jose Rentas was operating an ATV at a family gathering at Lake Ossewago located in Bass River Township. The defendant had a passenger on the back of the ATV. The investigation revealed that the defendant had ingested cocaine, marijuana and alcohol prior to driving the ATV. An analysis of a blood sample secured from the defendant revealed the presence of impairing levels of all three substances in his system at the time of the crash. The defendant collided head on with another ATV being operated by his niece (A.L.). The crash occurred as the two vehicles drove around a bend in the road toward each other at high rates of speed.

The defendant was seriously injured and his passenger suffered minor injuries. A.L. suffered fatal injuries while her passenger sustained a head injury. The defendant entered a plea of guilty to an accusation charging him with second-degree Vehicular Homicide and third-degree Assault by Auto. The defendant also pled guilty to Driving While Intoxicated. The defendant was sentenced to three years in New Jersey state prison with a period of parole ineligibility. The defendant's driving privileges were also suspended for five years.

State v. Shawn Curry

During the early morning hours of November 10, 2015, New Jersey State Police troopers from the Moorestown Station responded to a report of a hit-and-run fatal pedestrian accident in the area of milepost 34 on the New Jersey Turnpike. The investigation revealed that an elderly male suffering with dementia had left a nearby hotel and wandered onto the turnpike in the vicinity of Exit 4. The male pedestrian was then struck by a vehicle operated by defendant Shawn Curry.

The defendant was identified after an extensive cooperative investigation by the BCPO and the New Jersey State Police. The investigation included the recovery of E-ZPass toll records as well as images of multiple vehicles and vehicle registrations that passed through local interchanges at or about the time of the crash. Once a specific vehicle was identified and additional E-ZPass records were secured from the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, troopers were able to track the movements of the vehicle along the turnpike before and after the crash. Troopers were ultimately able to track the rental truck that struck the pedestrian to a facility in New Brunswick and ultimately to the defendant.

The truck was processed for evidence and biological samples were recovered. A subsequent analysis and comparison of the samples demonstrated that the pedestrian was the source of the samples secured from the truck. The defendant ultimately admitted that he was involved in an accident on the Turnpike in the vicinity where the body of the pedestrian was located. The defendant, however, initially claimed that he thought he struck the rear of another tractor trailer before saying that did not know what he had hit. The defendant also said that he left the scene because he did not want to get a ticket from the police. The defendant said that he later heard a news broadcast about the fatal crash on the Turnpike. At that point, the defendant said that he knew he had struck a person but still failed to contact the police. A forensic analysis of the defendant's cell phone demonstrated that he was in the vicinity of the crash scene at or about the time of the crash. The defendant entered a plea of guilty to an accusation charging him with second-degree Leaving the Scene of a Fatal Motor Vehicle Crash. The defendant also pled guilty to a motor vehicle summons charging him with Failing to Report an Accident. The defendant was sentenced to a period of probation conditioned upon a period of incarceration in the Burlington County Jail.

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 Act 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), 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.

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. In 2016, state and federal civil forfeiture generated \$241,149.00 in cash and property for use by law enforcement. From civil judgments and auction totals, \$102,163.16 was distributed to participating state and local law enforcement agencies and some \$114,935.00 was deposited in the BCPO Law Enforcement Trust Account.

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 2016, \$31,178.38 in Ten Percent Funds was distributed to participating departments.

Property forfeited includes cash, motor vehicles and miscellaneous items such as televisions and jewelry. 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 2016 included cash, cars and miscellaneous property. Twelve vehicles were turned over to local police departments for law enforcement use.

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 supervisory 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 2016, 170 cases were reviewed for forfeiture and 126 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 by 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.

**2016 CONTRIBUTIVE SHARES
DISTRIBUTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

BORDENTOWN TOWNSHIP	\$10,720.57
BURLINGTON CITY	1,306.25
BURLINGTON TOWNSHIP	4,173.25
CINNAMINSON TOWNSHIP	7,061.51
DELRAN TOWNSHIP	1,760.00
EDGEWATER PARK TWP	1,463.67
EVESHAM TOWNSHIP	2,478.36
FLORENCE TOWNSHIP	1,715.34
LUMBERTON TOWNSHIP	4,749.56
MAPLE SHADE TOWNSHIP	1,346.00
MEDFORD TOWNSHIP	456.00
MOUNT HOLLY TOWNSHIP	7,038.68
MOUNT LAUREL TWP	6,405.30
NEW HANOVER TOWNSHIP	489.34
NJ TREASURERS OFFICE CRIM INVESTIGATION	5,343.75
PALMYRA BOROUGH	476.67
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	8,778.68
RIVERSIDE TOWNSHIP	2,921.84
WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP	9,313.46
WILLINGBORO TOWNSHIP	10,025.83
NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE	14,139.10
GRAND TOTAL	\$102,163.16

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 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 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.

OPERATIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN 2016

In 2016, CSU detectives conducted approximately 28 death investigations involving 19 homicides. The remaining 10 death investigations included fatal motor vehicle collisions, fatal fires, suicides, suspicious death investigations, and child/infant fatalities. Additionally, CSU detectives conducted approximately 60 crime scene investigations involving attempted murders, fatal fires, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults, bank robberies, robberies, drug offenses, burglaries, weapons offenses, police-involved shootings and special investigations.

CSU detectives also conducted latent fingerprint examinations in approximately 25 cases, many of which involved subsequent comparison of latent prints to known prints, resulting in several positive identifications.

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. 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.

EMU 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 BCPO policy.

OPERATIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN 2016

In 2016, the Evidence Management Unit continued to digitize and electronically archive old case files and continued to move toward operating in a virtually paperless environment. In total, EMU received or released evidence on 4,001 occasions involving 1,532 different cases. Of those transactions, the evidence was directly generated by EMU in 406 cases during 2016. All other cases involved other BCPO units submitting evidence to or receiving evidence from EMU on their unit-generated cases.

FAMILY UNIT

The Family Unit consists of five assistant prosecutors, two assigned to the Juvenile section of the Unit, two to the Domestic Violence section and one supervisor. In addition to the attorneys assigned to the Unit, there are two clerical employees, one legal assistant, one victim witness advocate, one prosecutor's agent, and one detective. 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 functions of this Section 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 BCPO. This Section prosecutes incidents of domestic violence and takes indictable matters to the Grand Jury and to trial when necessary. Additionally, the Unit leads the County Domestic Violence Working Group. The Unit also screens and prosecutes interference with child custody cases and willful non-support matters. In addition to indictable cases, assistant prosecutors in the Unit are responsible for the prosecution of disorderly persons contempt cases in Family Court. Additionally, all

applications seeking the return of weapons seized as a result of domestic violence charges must be reviewed by the legal staff to ensure that the return is appropriate. Where forfeiture of weapons is sought an assistant prosecutor will argue such applications on behalf of the State. Assistant prosecutors in the Domestic Violence Section will prepare training materials for law enforcement and also the domestic violence response teams where necessary.

FINANCIAL CRIMES UNIT

The Financial Crimes Unit 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 fraud, Internet fraud, mortgage and loan modification fraud, money laundering, welfare fraud, embezzlement and identity theft cases.

This 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 investigate these types of crimes, as well as directly with the victims and financial institutions impacted by those crimes. The Financial Crimes Unit is responsible for issuing Grand Jury subpoenas, conducting interviews, and analyzing and reviewing financial records and 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, 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 complaints referred to the BCPO via the Office of Attorney General (Divisions of Criminal Justice and Consumer Affairs), the Burlington County Office of 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 clearinghouse 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.

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

Federal Agencies and Entities

- United States Attorney's Office (Newark and Camden Field Offices)
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
- United States Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
- United States Department of the Treasury
- Department of Homeland Security, Immigrations & Custom Enforcement

- United States Postal Inspection Service (USPIS)
- United States Department of Agriculture
- United States Secret Service (USSS)
- Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (New York Office)
- Office of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C)

State and County Agencies

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

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2016

The Bluebird Check Kiting Conspiracy

A two-year investigation by the BCPO Financial Crimes Unit and the Pemberton Township Police Department resulted in the arrests of 18 people who participated in a check-kiting conspiracy that defrauded 12 banks of more than \$107,000.

The participants were charged with opening multiple bank accounts for the purpose of depositing checks in order to artificially inflate the balances of the new accounts. The checks that were deposited were drawn on closed accounts, accounts with insufficient funds, or non-existent accounts. The banks would make a portion of the newly deposited funds available for immediate withdrawal, not knowing these accounts were established to facilitate a fraudulent scheme. This practice is commonly referred to as "check kiting."

The actual loss totaled \$107,563. However, the banks faced an additional exposure, or potential loss, of approximately \$247,000.

The investigation began when numerous American Express "Bluebird" checks drawn from an account in the name of one of the defendants began circulating in banks and businesses throughout the county.

Bluebird checks, when processed in a valid manner, provide guaranteed payment to the recipient. However, all of these checks were subsequently dishonored.

The investigation resulted in multiple convictions.

GANG, GUN AND NARCOTICS TASK FORCE

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF) was organized in October 1987, pursuant to the Attorney General's Statewide Narcotics Action Plan (SNAP) for Narcotics Enforcement. In March 1993, a working group consisting of law enforcement professionals revised this plan, which provides guidance for all task force operations. This plan is now commonly referred to as "SNAP II Guidelines." As the narcotics enforcement plan evolved, a three-part strategy for curtailing street violence, combating violent street gangs and ensuring safe neighborhoods in the Garden State was introduced. The strategy reinforced issues of enforcement, prevention and re-entry with an emphasis on reducing gang violence, violent crime and recidivism. It followed a strategy that was rooted in intelligence-led policing. The primary enforcement aspect of the plan was aimed at targeting and prosecuting those who engage in gang violence and carry illegal weapons.

In March 2008, the Narcotics Task Force's name was officially changed to the Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force (GGNTF), pursuant to New Jersey's Safe Streets - Safe Neighborhoods Initiative. Additionally, the name change was a requirement to participants in the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, which is a grant managed by the State of New Jersey and used to finance all aspects of the Statewide Multi-Jurisdictional County Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Forces.

The Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force is responsible for investigations leading to the arrest and conviction of individuals who violate the Comprehensive Drug Reform Act of New Jersey. The GGNTF currently operates with one sergeant and five detectives coming under the direction of a lieutenant and a captain.

Two assistant prosecutors are assigned to the Unit, including the Unit supervisor, who is responsible for the daily functions of the Unit, along with providing legal services to all Burlington County municipal police agencies and the New Jersey State Police. Additionally, municipal police officers within Burlington County are periodically assigned to the GGNTF as Task Force Officers (TFO). While assigned to the GGNTF, a TFO receives training in all aspects of narcotics investigations. They then return to their respective agencies and use their training and acquired knowledge to coordinate their own narcotics cases and/or start up their own gun and narcotics investigation unit. In 2016, the Burlington Township Police Department and the Bordentown Township Police Department participated in the TFO program.

The Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force renders assistance to municipal police departments and other agencies throughout Burlington County. Gun and narcotics investigations are developed through information received from federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, the Secret Witness Hotline, confidential informants, citizen

complaints, arrested individuals and complaint websites. The GGNTF is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

During 2016, detectives assigned to the GGNTF received refresher training on a continuing basis on the latest trends in drug use, investigative and surveillance techniques and the ever-changing law governing search and seizure. The GGNTF also provided training for local officers covering topics such as drug identification, investigative interviews, surveillance techniques, search warrant preparation and service, undercover investigations and other drug-related topics.

The GGNTF made arrangements for officers from local departments to attend training at various seminars sponsored by the Drug Enforcement Administration, New Jersey Narcotics Enforcement Officers Association, Northeast Counterdrug Training Center, Middle Atlantic Great Lakes Organized Crime Law Enforcement Network (MAGLOCLN), Multi-Jurisdictional Counter Drug Training Center, the Southern Counties and Statewide County Narcotics Task Force Commanders Associations, as well as the State of New Jersey's Division of Criminal Justice.

TRENDS IN BURLINGTON COUNTY

Drug enforcement issues arising in Burlington County reflect continuing statewide, national and international problems. As the county continues to grow and be developed, so do problems with gangs, guns and drugs.

Opiate-induced (heroin) drug overdoses in the county continue to increase despite a proactive GGNTF and municipal agency enforcement campaign, local drug awareness programs, expanded access to drug treatment centers. In 2016, Burlington County experienced 83 accidental overdose deaths. Fentanyl, as well as derivatives of Fentanyl, has been identified as the primary adulterant used to increase the potency of low-quality heroin. Fentanyl is a potent, synthetic opioid analgesic with a rapid onset and short duration of action. It is approximately 80 to 100 times more potent than morphine and roughly 40 to 50 times more potent than pharmaceutical grade (100% pure) heroin.

Since April 2014, New Jersey law enforcement has been authorized to carry and administer Naloxone. Naloxone, marketed under the trade name Narcan among others, is a pure opioid antagonist and is used to counter the effects of opioids, especially in an overdose situation. In 2015, there were 137 deployments resulting in 131 saves. During 2016, 195 Naloxone deployments resulted in 188 saves.

In 2016, methamphetamine and crystal methamphetamine seizures in the County saw significant increases. Crystal methamphetamine, or "ice," has also swept into other parts of the country, most notably the Pacific Northwest, West Coast and the Southwest, as Mexican cartels have added this drug to their growing smorgasbord of available controlled dangerous substances

Street gangs also continue to make headlines. Along with the drug dealing traditionally associated with street gangs, there was an increase in violent crimes, such as beatings and convenience store robberies. Gang members use violence as the primary tactic to resolve turf disputes, instill discipline among their own ranks and intimidate persons likely to cooperate with law enforcement. The gangs have also made themselves more complex in terms of structure and their means of communication. Many gangs use social media to communicate and post meeting information to spread their various ideologies.

The marijuana market continues to be pervasive in Burlington County. The grades of marijuana vary, with the high-grade product grown hydroponically indoors. There has been marijuana that has been engineered (grafted by using different breeds), known as hybrids. In 2010, the State passed a bill, known as the "New Jersey Compassionate Use Medical Marijuana Act," which legalized the possession of marijuana by certain entities meeting predetermined criteria. Burlington County continues to see a continued rise in marijuana seizures via mail delivery services, which is directly attributed to the 23 states and the District of Columbia that have legalized the possession of certain amounts of marijuana and THC-based edibles.

The cocaine market in Burlington County continues to remain steady and active. Street sales of cocaine in the form of both crack and powder cocaine have been constant in certain areas of the county.

Local dealers commonly travel to Philadelphia or Trenton using the River Line Transportation System to purchase cocaine in powder form. They then travel back to Burlington County and convert the cocaine into cocaine-base, known on the street as "crack." Seizures of powder cocaine have risen, as enforcement efforts have been increased to combat this problem, though for several years, "crack" cocaine has been the drug of choice in many areas of the county.

Burlington County is also experiencing the epidemic regarding the illicit pill trade. Cases involving diversion of controlled medications, such as OxyContin, Percocet and Xanax, to name a few, have grown exponentially. Prescription pad thefts are on the rise as a result of burglaries of medical offices. The stolen prescriptions end up getting filled at local pharmacies or sold to individuals who then fill the prescription in hopes of turning a hefty profit. Reports continue to be received regarding the forgery of prepared and signed prescriptions. Perpetrators modified the prescriptions by dipping them in an alcohol solution, in an effort to "lift" away the original pen ink used and would then generate a totally new prescription, usually for the controlled variety of medication. Another disturbing trend is the use of pills, such as Diltiazem as an adulterant. Its use enhances and prolongs the effects of opioids, as well as amplifies the overdose potential of heroin. It is a strong depressant that combats the come-down effects of cocaine and heroin with massive risk.

The State of New Jersey continued to battle the opioid epidemic by using its Prescription Monitoring Program (PMP) as a tool to track and identify entities involved

with abusive dispensing and filling of prescriptions. A team of investigators from the Division of Criminal Justice, dubbed the "Prescription Fraud Investigative Strike Team" (PFIST) has been assembled to assist local agencies to specifically target healthcare providers.

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2016

State v. Dante Fox

The defendant was the subject of an investigation that culminated in his arrest on charges of first-degree Possession with Intent to Distribute cocaine. Between the investigation and the execution of a search warrant at his home, police seized over five pounds of cocaine and in excess of \$80,000 in cash. He is currently serving a sentence of 15 years in New Jersey state prison as a result of the investigation.

State v. Arthur Burns

During the course of an extensive and lengthy investigation, the defendant was charged with selling more than four ounces of cocaine to an undercover narcotics detective and five pounds of cocaine to various other individuals. Police also seized \$20,000 in cash. The defendant pled guilty and was sentenced to 14 years in New Jersey state prison.

State v. Vaughn Williams

An undercover agent purchased nine ounces of cocaine from the defendant, who pled guilty and was sentenced to 11 years in New Jersey state prison.

State v. Tracie Hines

An anonymous tip was sent to Crime Stoppers indicating that the defendant had a marijuana grow facility inside her residence. GGNTF detectives and members of the Evesham Police Department conducted an investigation and were given consent to search the home. Inside they located 84 marijuana plants and a ventilation system in the basement. The defendant was sentenced to five years in New Jersey state prison.

GGNTF QUALITY OF LIFE PRO-ACTIVE OPERATIONS

In 2016, GGNTF assisted several municipal police departments with Quality of Life Initiatives. The primary enforcement aspect of the plan was aimed at targeting those who engaged in open-air drug trafficking near schools or in primary routes of travel utilized by students to get to school. Throughout these initiatives, undercover officers would approach suspected drug peddlers and make purchases of crack cocaine, marijuana and pills. Then, arrest warrants were secured and tactically served.

These cases highlight the many and varied types of investigations conducted by the Gang, Gun and Narcotics Task Force in 2016. Nearly 90 investigations were conducted during this time period. Working with local, state and federal agencies, the GGNTF served search warrants in numerous municipalities resulting in the seizure of drugs including marijuana, cocaine, MDMA (Ecstasy), ethylone, methamphetamine and heroin, along with firearms, U.S. currency and other contraband. Many of these warrants were executed in areas where street level drug distribution was occurring and accompanied by a high incidence of violence that required the use of the New Jersey State Police T.E.A.M.S. Unit or the tactical team operated by the municipality in which the search warrant was to be served.

GRAND JURY/CASE SCREENING UNIT

The Grand Jury/Case Screening Unit reviews all cases in which an adult has been charged with an indictable offense in Burlington County. Although the majority of cases are prosecuted as indictable matters at the Superior Court level, some matters may be downgraded and referred to municipal court for prosecution as a disorderly persons offense. It is the responsibility of the assistant prosecutors in the Unit to screen all cases for factual and legal sufficiency. When additional issues are identified, or further investigation is warranted, the assistant prosecutors work with municipal police departments and county detectives to gather additional evidence. The assistant prosecutors also assist police officers with initial charging decisions. Once a case has been thoroughly screened and investigated, it is the responsibility of the Unit's assistant prosecutors to present it to the Grand Jury.

In addition to screening each case, the assistant prosecutors in the Unit also administer the Pre-Indictment Program, referred to in this county as PIP. PIP is an alternative disposition tool for criminal matters which allows for possible pre-indictment resolutions in cases which might otherwise have been presented to the Grand Jury. Resolved cases are pled to accusations for indictable charges, some occasionally being for a lesser offense.

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

The Unit consists of five assistant prosecutors, three prosecutor's agents, one detective and clerical personnel, and is supervised by an assistant prosecutor. In 2016, the Unit screened 5,038 complaints. Nearly 1,200 defendants were indicted.

HIGH-TECH CRIMES/DIGITAL FORENSIC UNIT

The High-Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit (HTCU) 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, HTCU examines offenses involving the exploitation of children, network intrusion, hacking and DNS attacks. The Unit is staffed by two detectives and overseen by a detective sergeant.

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 HTCU assists the various units of the BCPO, along with local, state and federal agencies with search warrants and digital forensic examinations, to include computers, digital cameras, USB flash drives, Digital Video Recorder (DVR) systems, cellular telephones, iPods, iPads, tablets and GPS devices.

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

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

For the first component, investigators operate in an undercover capacity in an effort to identify sexual predators, frauds and scams, criminal organizations, online narcotics activity, child prostitution and pornography, hackers, terrorist organizations and other felonious activity facilitated through the use of the Internet and other data communications technology. The second component involves forensically processing digital evidence for multiple units within the BCPO and 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 2016, HTCU Tech Crimes/Digital Forensics Unit assisted in more than 600 digital forensic examinations on over 475 different pieces of evidence, to include computers, digital cameras, USB flash drives, cellular telephones, small scale digital devices, tablet, GPS devices and Digital Video Recorder (DVR) systems.

SIGNIFICANT CASES DURING 2016

State v. Daniel Caplan

As part of the ICAC Task Force, the HTCUC initiated an investigation based upon a cyber tip report from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) regarding the uploading of images of child sexual abuse. The Internet Protocol address that was used to upload the images came back to a residence in Mount Laurel Township. A search warrant was served at the residence by the BCPO, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police Digital Technology Investigation Unit, and the Mount Laurel Township Police Department. A forensic examination of the digital items seized was conducted by HTCUC, which ultimately located numerous images and videos of child sexual abuse on a computer associated with Daniel Caplan. These videos were created by Caplan while chatting online with underage pre-pubescent females during which Caplan convinced the girls to get naked and in some instances convince the girls to touch themselves sexually. Caplan created the videos using a software program on his computer that would allow him to record the computer screen as he saw it at the time. At the time the warrant was served, Caplan had pled guilty to a previous case for Manufacturing of Child Pornography and was awaiting sentencing.

State v. Bryan White

The HTCUC responded to a complaint by the Florence Township Police Department regarding a 13-year-old female who was communicating with an individual in Connecticut who wanted to have sexual relations with her. The detective sergeant took over the identity of the 13-year-old and began communicating with the subject. The subject (later identified as Bryan White) who was already a registered sex offender, immediately turned the conversation sexual, and arranged to meet with the undercover detective to have sex with her – thinking she was 13 years old. Arrangements were made for the 13-year-old to travel via bus to New London, Connecticut to meet with White. The detective sergeant was able to get detailed communication from White regarding what type of sexual things he wanted to do after meeting the juvenile. Ultimately, White traveled to the bus station in New London and texted that he had arrived. White was arrested and found to be in possession of condoms and alcoholic drinks that he mentioned he would bring. White was charged by Connecticut authorities with Criminal Attempt to Commit Sexual Assault and Criminal Attempt to Commit Risk of Injury to a Minor. White was also charged by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement Homeland Security Investigations with Attempted Enticement of a Minor to Engage in Unlawful Sexual Activity, to which he pled guilty to on February 22, 2017. White was sentenced to 17.5 years in federal prison for this offense.

State v. Robert Magrann

As part of the ICAC Task Force, the HTCUC initiated an investigation based upon a referral from New Jersey State Police regarding an individual sharing child pornography through the BitTorrent Peer-2-Peer file sharing network. The Internet Protocol address

associated with this case came back to the residence of Robert Magrann in Maple Shade. The assigned New Jersey State Police trooper was able to download several files of child pornography. In June 2016, the HTCUC obtained a search warrant for the residence in Maple Shade, which was ultimately executed at the residence by the BCPO, with the assistance of the New Jersey State Police – Digital Technology Investigation Unit and the Maple Shade Police Department. A forensic examination of the digital items seized was conducted by the HTCUC, which ultimately located more than 10,000 images of child sexual abuse on a computer associated with Robert Magrann. He was charged with Distribution of Child Pornography and Possession of Child Pornography. Magrann pled guilty and was sentenced to four years in state prison.

2016 CASES INVOLVING DIGITAL FORENSICS

State v. Dennis Pozniak

The HTCUC assisted in the prosecution of Dennis Pozniak for the murders of Bryan Wilson and Nicole Wilson. A detective sergeant assigned to the HTCUC was qualified as an expert witness in cell phone forensics relating to examinations of the defendant's cellular telephone. The detective sergeant provided testimony relating to the forensic examination of the defendant's cellular telephone and numerous text communications. Pozniak was found guilty of two counts of Murder and sentenced to 60 years to life in New Jersey state prison.

State v. Erik Carmona

The HTCUC assisted the Evesham Township Police Department in a strict liability death investigation. The victim overdosed on heroin. A forensic examination of his cellular telephone revealed the heroin was provided by Erik Carmona. The HTCUC also assisted in mapping out the cell phone records for Erik Carmona's cell phone provider. Erik Carmona died on July 8, 2016 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as a result of a Fentanyl overdose while awaiting trial.

State v. William Gennett

The HTCUC assisted the Major Crimes Unit and Lumberton Township Police Department with investigating the homicide of Shannon O'Rourke on July 6, 2016. A forensic examination of the suspect's cell phone revealed that he had purchased and installed spy monitoring software on the victim's cell phone. This software would allow the suspect to remotely view content such as text messages, call logs, emails and social media accounts on the victim's phone along with the actual GPS location of the device. William Gennett was indicted by a grand jury in May 2017 and is awaiting trial.

State v. Christopher Costello and Bryan Costello

The HTCUC assisted the Major Crimes Unit and Lumberton Township Police Department with investigating the homicide of Justin DuBois in November 2016. A forensic

examination of the suspects' cell phones revealed that they were attempting to sell numerous belongings of the victims after he was killed. Christopher Costello and Bryan Costello have been indicted for murder and are awaiting trial, which will be held in early 2018.

State v. Sabrina Givens and Christopher Weldon

The HTCUC assisted the Medford Township Police Department regarding a burglary investigation. Forensic examinations were conducted on two cell phones that were seized as part of this investigation. The extracted information provided crucial evidence that led to the arrest of two subjects for committing 17 commercial burglaries in five counties. Sabrina Givens and Christopher Weldon were charged with numerous offenses.

State v. Tiray Jones and Paul Williams

The HTCUC assisted the Medford Township Police Department regarding a burglary investigation. Forensic examinations were conducted on nine devices that were seized as part of this investigation. The extracted information provided additional evidence that resulted in the arrest of three subjects for committing four commercial burglaries in three counties as well as significant drug and weapons charges. Tiray Jones and Paul Williams were charged with numerous offenses.

State v. Francisco Rodriguez, Hugoberto Silverio, Rafael Silverio

The HTCUC assisted the Bordentown Township Police Department regarding a theft investigation. This investigation began as local supermarkets throughout New Jersey and Pennsylvania were experiencing an increase in plastic container thefts. Two suspects were apprehended in the act and cellular phones were secured from their persons. Forensic examinations of the cell phones revealed GPS location data which was able to tie the suspects to numerous other theft cases. The analysis of the phones provided by the HTCUC not only solved the previous two thefts in Bordentown Township, but also closed cases for multiple other agencies throughout New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT

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

The Burlington County Counter-Terrorism Coordinator (CCTC) is tasked with the duties of investigating suspected acts of terrorism and collecting and disseminating counter-

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

Other duties of the CCTC include the identification and evaluation of critical infrastructures and key assets within Burlington County, and maintaining data on these sites and their appropriate points of contact. This data is entered into state databases through OHSP. In conjunction with OHSP and New Jersey State Police, the CCTC is tasked with assessing the identified critical infrastructure 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 2016 by a Supervising Data Control Clerk, who performs a multitude of duties to assist staff with investigative and prosecutorial pursuits.

Duties include data entry of case notes, printing reports, and maintaining the inventory and security of the PROMIS/GAVEL System in accordance with the procedures established by the Administrative Office of the Courts. ISU personnel are designated to access Criminal Justice Information System to obtain state and federal criminal histories as well as driver's 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 2016, 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.

In 2016, the Insurance Fraud Unit began a new proactive initiative working directly with Motor Vehicle Commission investigators to target and investigate individuals fraudulently registering their motor vehicles in Burlington County. This new initiative led to more investigations and the development of cases with stronger proofs. The Insurance Fraud Unit also voluntarily developed and implemented a training presentation as part of the semi-annual Criminal Investigation Course which is offered to investigators throughout the county and the surrounding region. Course instruction also provides the platform to implement a new county-wide Prescription Fraud Form which better facilitates the investigation and prosecution of related insurance crimes.

During 2016, cases prosecuted by the Insurance Fraud Unit resulted in restitution payments of more than \$54,000.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICES UNIT

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

In 2016, ISU was comprised of one detective and a trained analyst as a prosecutor's agent. ISU is an active member of the Burlington County Gang Task Force and is responsible for coordinating the quarterly Gang Task Force meetings and

administering the Annual Gang Seminar training. Its members teach blocks of instruction on intelligence and gang awareness. They also provide semi-annual training for the County's Advanced Criminal Investigations Course, along with assisting and scheduling 28 CFR Part 23 training and Intelligence Module training. ISU produces intelligence products to include a bi-monthly intelligence brief, flow charts, time lines, link, telephone and GPS analysis, Nalaxone deployment reports, and continuous county-wide gang threat assessments. Part of ISU's mission is to identify gangs, members, associates, trends, locations and potential hotspots for criminal activity, in addition to providing support in the courtroom with regards to gang identification and methods of communication. To date, 30 Burlington County municipal police agencies participate in the Infoshare Intelligence Sharing Program with a total of 64 police officers and detectives from the various agencies having access to the database.

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

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

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

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

ISU is also responsible for providing blocks of instruction on gang awareness to schools, to include students and school administrators. In addition to schools, the Intelligence Services Unit provides yearly training to the United States Air Force's First Sergeants at Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.

In July 2014, the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Intelligence Services Unit commenced tracking Naloxone deployments by law enforcement in Burlington County. In 2016, there were 195 Naloxone deployments by Burlington County law enforcement.

MAJOR CRIMES UNIT

The Major Crimes Unit (MCU) 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. MCU also supports other BCPO investigative units, including Special Investigations, in cases such as police-involved shootings and frauds, the Collision and Analysis Reconstruction Unit, the Homeland Security Unit, and the Insurance Fraud Unit.

The Major Crimes Unit consists of the supervising assistant prosecutor and another assistant prosecutor, one captain and one lieutenant, who each serve in a supervisory capacity, two detective sergeants and five detectives.

SIGNIFICANT CASES

State v. Kyle Crosby

The remains of Erica Crippen, 26, of Mount Laurel, were discovered March 17, 2015, by investigators in a rural area in Sykesville, Maryland. She was found underneath a pile of branches and limbs in a grove of pine trees off of Old Frederick Road in Carroll County. She was wrapped in a fleece blanket. Her hands and feet had been bound with a cord that was also wrapped around her neck. She had duct tape across her mouth and nose.

The search was conducted following a forensic examination of the Global Positioning System found in the vehicle of her husband, Kyle Crosby, after he was taken into custody on January 12. More than 8,600 coordinates had been recorded by the GPS device. Investigators determined that the defendant had spent more time along Old Frederick Road in Carroll County than at other locations and concentrated the search in that area.

An autopsy performed by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner in Baltimore, Maryland concluded that the manner of death was homicide and the cause was asphyxiation.

Erica Crippen lived with the defendant and two children, their 3-month-old daughter and a 7-year-old daughter she had from a previous relationship. Her disappearance was brought to the attention of law enforcement officers after school officials contacted the Mount Laurel Police Department on January 7 and requested a wellness check at the family's residence.

The request came after neither parent was present to pick up the older daughter at the end of the school day.

The defendant signed a missing person report that day indicating he had not seen his wife since January 1. Further investigation led to charges against the defendant filed on January 10 for Endangering the Welfare of a Child due to the inadequate level of care he provided to the children in the absence of his wife. The existence of the charge allowed law enforcement officers to execute the traffic stop on January 12 and detain the defendant.

Evidence discovered in the vehicle resulted in homicide charges against Crosby in the absence of a body. Once Erica's remains were recovered, Crosby pled guilty to fatally choking his wife inside of their home on December 31, 2014 and transporting her body to Maryland. He was sentenced to 28 years in New Jersey state prison on March 10, 2016.

State v. Stephen R. Donaldson

On February 12, 2013, in Cinnaminson, Steven R. Donaldson, 32, was caring for 1-year-old Claudia Nunes while the toddler's foster mother, who Donaldson was dating, was at work.

At approximately 8 p.m., Donaldson placed a call to 9-1-1 and indicated that Claudia was not breathing. Law enforcement and emergency medical technicians who responded were unable to revive Claudia. She was taken to Kennedy University Hospital in Cherry Hill, where she was pronounced dead.

Donaldson claimed that Claudia fell and struck her head on the floor as he was preparing to change her diaper. However, an autopsy performed by Burlington County Medical Examiner Dr. Ian Hood concluded that the cause of death was blunt force trauma to the head. Dr. Hood testified during the trial that Claudia's injuries included a fractured skull, brain swelling and bleeding.

Following a five-week trial, a Superior Court jury found Donaldson guilty of Aggravated Manslaughter and Endangering the Welfare of a Child. He was sentenced to 20 years in New Jersey state prison by the Hon. Charles A. Delehey, J.S.C. on January 21, 2016.

PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT

The Burlington County Prosecutor's Office Public Information Unit was staffed during 2016 by one civilian prosecutor's agent 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 the on-scene investigators and legal personnel from that duty.

The Unit distributes press releases, executes 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 filed and maintained by the Public Information Officer, as well as posted on the Office's web site. 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, and arranges for Office participation in community and civic events.

PROCOPS AWARDS BANQUET

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

Along with the Prosecutor's awards, the Annual Richard L. Barbour Scholarship Award is presented to a law student selected by the Scholarship Committee. The scholarship was founded in memory of Burlington County Assistant Prosecutor Richard L. Barbour, who was slain during a robbery in Philadelphia in April 1991. The banquet is held in May during National Police Week and is attended by approximately 150 people.

SEXUAL ASSAULT/CHILD ABUSE UNIT

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.

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

Burlington County uses a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) approach to investigation and prosecution, which connects the detectives and prosecutors with mental health agencies, the state Department of Children and Families, and educational and medical professionals. The purpose of the MDT approach is to minimize the impact of the criminal investigation on an already traumatized child. 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 SACA Unit. The Megan's Law Unit works closely with the SACA Unit 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 sexual 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.

SART/SANE COORDINATOR

The SART/SANE Coordinator is responsible for the recruitment, training and supervision of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners who contract with Burlington County to provide medical forensic exams to victims of sexual assault. The coordinator is the liaison to the five participating SART (Sexual Assault Response Team) sites. 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, including response time and provides feedback to nurses on their roles as nurse examiners.

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 medication to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, provide counseling and referrals, maintain chain-of-custody, and testify at trial. In cases of chronic sexual abuse, an exam is done if the most recent abuse has occurred within the past five days of the exam.

During 2016, the SART/SANE program was responsible for responding to 112 calls and conducting 96 forensic examinations of individuals who reported being victims of sexual assault at the five exam sites in Burlington County.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

During 2016, the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) was comprised of one detective sergeant and one detective. The unit is supervised by an assistant prosecutor. The chain of command for SIU includes one lieutenant and one captain. The assigned lieutenant conducts investigations when necessary.

SIU conducts inquiries and/or investigations into a wide variety of matters including criminal complaints, allegations of official misconduct, claims of misfeasance or malfeasance, political corruption, Sunshine Law violations, Open Public Meetings Act violations and other confidential and/or sensitive matters which involve local or county law enforcement officers, as well as elected or appointed public officials. SIU also investigates matters referred to the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office from the Office of the Governor, Division of Criminal Justice, and elected officials.

In addition, SIU conducts internal affairs investigations of complaints against Prosecutor's Office employees. SIU also provides assistance and support to municipal police departments conducting their own internal affairs investigations. SIU also provides polygraph support to both the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office and other law enforcement agencies operating within Burlington County. The polygraph examinations are administered by the lieutenant assigned to the Unit. SIU also conducts background investigations on prospective employees of the BCPO.

In 2016, the Special Investigations Unit conducted 108 investigations.

TRIAL UNIT

The Trial Unit is responsible for handling the majority of cases following indictment by the Grand Jury. This includes reviewing files upon indictment, negotiating plea agreements, arguing motions, trying cases, handling sentencing 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 and three secretaries. 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 DURING 2016

State v. Demetrius Cope

On July 5, 2006, police arrived at the Burlington City apartment of Demetrius Cope to serve an arrest warrant. Once inside the apartment, officers observed and seized a camouflage rifle case containing ammunition and a rifle reported stolen from Pennsylvania. The defendant had previously been convicted of a crime and was prohibited from possessing a firearm and, as a result, was indicted as a Certain Person Not to Possess Firearms, a second-degree offense.

In May of 2011, the defendant was convicted following a jury trial. At sentencing, the court granted the State's motion for imposition of a discretionary extended term and sentenced defendant to a term of twelve years and a period of parole ineligibility of six years. The defendant appealed, and the New Jersey Supreme Court found that the protective sweep of defendant's apartment that led to the discovery of the rifle was lawful. However, the Court remanded the matter for retrial to allow the defendant to present evidence in support of a defense that a third party was guilty.

The defendant's second trial began on December 8, 2016. Despite the fact that the Supreme Court held that it was error to exclude third-party guilt evidence from the original trial, the defendant did not call the third-party, Dante Santiago, to testify. Instead, the defendant introduced a 2011 video interview between Santiago and two detectives from the Burlington County Prosecutor's Office as well as a letter allegedly authored by Santiago. In the 2011 interview, Santiago claimed ownership of the weapon. However, during rebuttal, the jury heard testimony from a defense investigator that Santiago disavowed his 2011 statement and indicated that he was coerced into taking responsibility for the weapon. The defendant was convicted yet again.

On February 23, 2017, the trial court denied the State's motion for imposition of an extended term, and imposed the minimum sentence of five years in New Jersey state prison with five years to be served without parole. The matter was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Matthew Lynch.

State v. Arnold Eckhardt

On the night of September 9, 2015, the defendant, Arnold Eckhardt, was operating a tractor-trailer on the New Jersey Turnpike heading south. He had just completed a delivery in Boston and had pulled into the Petro Truck Stop, located off Exit 7 of the Turnpike in Bordentown Township. After entering through the main gate and stopping to take a ticket, he pulled alongside a white tractor-trailer and exited his truck.

According to eyewitnesses, the defendant opened the door of the white tractor-trailer, pulled the driver out and proceeded to physically attack him while he lay on the ground. Witnesses who observed this incident called police. The defendant then got back into his truck and exited the lot, which was captured on surveillance footage.

When the police arrived, the victim was standing inside of the cabin of his truck and appeared to be disoriented. He was bleeding profusely from the mouth and could barely speak. The victim was transported to a Trenton hospital. By the time he reached the trauma bay, he had suffered multiple strokes and a tear to his carotid artery, requiring emergency surgery by a vascular neurosurgeon. The victim remained hospitalized for two weeks, where he was intubated and unable to speak. As a result of the strokes, he lost use of the right side of his body, including his arm and right side of his face.

Police were able to trace the defendant's tractor-trailer to Mercer Transportation. The company confirmed that the defendant was the driver of the vehicle and was in the Petro station that night. New Jersey Turnpike Authority and E-ZPass records also confirmed his whereabouts. The defendant was located and interviewed. He acknowledged that he was involved in an altercation with the victim, but indicated that the victim "brake checked him to a stop" on the Turnpike, causing his truck to stall in the middle lane. The defendant also claimed the victim was able to stand and fight back, and was not incapacitated when he left the truck stop.

The defendant was indicted for Aggravated Assault. At the conclusion of the trial, the jury hung. The defendant subsequently pled guilty to third-degree Aggravated Assault. The defendant served more than a year in jail awaiting trial and was sentenced to time served. The matter was prosecuted by Assistant Prosecutor Lisa Commentucci.

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

The purpose of the Burlington County Office of Victim Witness Advocacy (The Victim Witness Unit) is to ensure that the rights of crime victims and witnesses are protected and that their needs receive full attention. The staff is comprised of one coordinator, five victim advocates, and one secretary, who all serve as liaisons between the victim and the criminal justice system. The advocates work closely with assistant prosecutors and the law enforcement community to help victims understand the vital role they play in the criminal justice process. We are committed to serving the needs of crime victims and witnesses. Our primary goal is to provide victims with services and support to help them cope with the aftermath of victimization, while trying to make their participation in the criminal justice system less difficult and burdensome.

Our services respond to a diversity of needs, providing answers and explanations about a system that victims and witnesses often find confusing.

In 2016, the Victim Witness Unit reached out to over 3,500 new crime victims, while providing services on more than 20,000 different occasions to each new victim and to victims and witnesses whose cases began prior to 2016. The range of referrals that our program provides extends to the non-profit sector, law enforcement, and state and federal government.

A significant amount of written correspondence is mailed out daily by the Unit secretary and the advocates. In 2016, approximately 35,000 case status letters were mailed out to victims and witnesses of crime. The VINE system, along with assistance from victim advocates, ensured that over 1,250 notifications were mailed to victims advising them about the parole status or release of a violent offender from the New Jersey Department of Corrections or the Burlington County Jail.

Advocates frequently escort victims and their families to court, offering support and a caring ear for case status hearings and trials. The staff is also actively involved with any homicide investigation that occurs within Burlington County. The Victim Witness Unit works closely with the BCPO Major Crimes Unit to provide immediate service to the families of homicide victims.

In order to provide these services, an advocate is contacted at the time of the crime and will respond to the local police department or hospital to aid surviving family members. In those circumstances where immediate outreach is problematic, the assigned advocate will contact the family within 24 hours after the homicide. This enables the advocate to start a working relationship with the family while offering services from the Victims of Crime Compensation Office and other agencies.

On a daily basis the advocates also bear witness to the great strength and perseverance that crime victims and victim survivors display as they navigate through the criminal justice system. In recognition of this journey, our Office annually sponsors three National Crime Victims' Rights Week events. The theme for 2016, "Serving Victims, Building Trust, Restoring Hope," reflected the goals the Victim Witness Unit strived each day to achieve while interacting with crime victims and their families as they are thrust into a system that they never chose to become a part of. 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.

During the week of April 10th - April 16th, 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.

Our well-attended Annual Crime Victims' Rights Week breakfast was held on April 13, 2016 at the Westin Hotel in Mount Laurel. Local politicians, members of the law enforcement community, victims and their families all came together to honor the journey of crime victims. One of the speakers was a victim survivor whose brother, a dedicated police officer, was killed by his wife several years ago. She provided inspiration and hope and rejuvenated the spirits of all who heard her.

The Victim Witness Unit continued its newest tradition for Crime Victims' Rights Week, which was the "Stride for Survivors" 5K Fun Run/Walk co-sponsored with the Burlington County Sheriff's Department, CONTACT of Burlington County and New Jersey State Police. It was held at the historic Smithville Park in Eastampton on April 17 and was very successful again, with more than 200 participants. There were information tables for many social service and law enforcement agencies, and participants received a T-shirt and refreshments.

Immediately following The Stride, the Victim Witness Unit held its Annual Candlelight Vigil at the same venue, and it was well-attended by some Stride participants, as well as many family members of victims from homicide cases. The brief, yet powerful, vigil gives all in attendance the opportunity to light a candle in memory and reverence to the loss of their loved ones and experience fellowship with other concerned individuals. About 175 people attended, and it is a valuable tradition to all of us, and the families we serve.

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

PROSECUTORIAL SCREENING OF DEFENDANTS

SCREENING OUTCOMES	STAGE OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS WHEN DECISION OCCURS	
	PRE-COMPLAINT DECISIONS	POST-COMPLAINT DECISIONS
a. Defendants administratively dismissed	0	448
b. Defendants with charges downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0	2806
c. Defendants accepted for pre-trial diversion	0	99
d. Defendants otherwise screened out	0	89
e. Defendants with change of venue	0	17
f. Accusations filed	0	277
g. Defendants with either indictable complaints authorized or charges approved for grand jury	0	816
H. AOC correction defendants that completed grand jury	0	486
TOTAL SCREENING DECISIONS FOR YEAR (add a - h)	0	5038

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	97	123
2. Recommended for acceptance	97	123
3. Recommended for rejection	9	19
4. Accepted into program	99	125

Section IV. 2.

Section/Unit INFORMATION SYSTEMS UNIT
County BURLINGTON

completing report
Section IV. 3.a.

Year 2016

**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	86	0
2. 1+ to 2 months	154	0
3. 2+ TO 3 Months	114	1
4. 3+ to 4 months	99	5
5. Over 4 months	350	7
6. TOTAL defendant cases pending grand jury	803	13

Rev. 1995

DEFENDANTS COMPLETING THE GRAND JURY PROCESS AND ACTION TAKEN

ACTION TAKEN	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants presented to the grand jury	1221
2. Defendants indicted	1193
3. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
4. Defendants no billed/no action	28
5. TOTAL defendants completing the grand jury process	1221

DEFENDANTS CHARGED BY ACCUSATION

	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
TOTAL Defendants charged through Accusation	277

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	122	35
2. 3+ to 6 months	54	36
3. 6+ to 9 months	36	36
4. 9+ to 12 months	17	29
5. 12+ to 24 months	23	71
6. 24+ months	223	390
7. TOTAL post-indictment/accusation defendant cases pending	475	597

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	8	2	13	47	43	79	95	0	238	0	10
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	2	1	7	14	4	26	9	0	16	1	1
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	0	1	0	2	2	19	3	0	15	0	1
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense											
a. Jury	4	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Guilty at trial, lesser indictable offense											
a. Jury	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
6. Guilty at trial, dis. persons offense											
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Not guilty at trial											
a. Jury	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
8. Acceptance into diversion program	0	0	2	1	5	4	17	0	30	0	3
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	0	3	2	24	3	30	14	0	48	0	1
11. TOTAL dispositions	16	13	27	92	58	163	139	0	347	2	16

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	190	40	33	22	0	0	32	11	83	946
2. Guilty plea to lesser indictable offense	29	2	4	4	0	0	9	0	2	131
3. Ind. dism., plea to dis. persons offense	11	1	3	1	0	0	2	1	2	64
4. Guilty at trial, most serious offense										
a. Jury	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Guilty at trial, lesser indictable offense										
a. Jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	12
b. Non-jury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
8. Acceptance into diversion program	26	18	9	1	0	0	7	0	4	127
9. Dismissed over objection of pros.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
10. Dismissed pros. motion or consent	32	2	15	0	0	0	8	0	15	197
11. TOTAL dispositions	290	64	64	28	0	0	59	12	107	1497

**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	41
2. TOTAL post-conviction relief applications filed involving the prosecutor's office	24
a. Defendants granted relief	0
b. Defendants denied relief	12
3. TOTAL habeas corpus petitions filed involving the prosecutor's office	4
a. Defendants granted relief	0
b. Defendants denied relief	2

Rev. 1995

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	0
2. Defendants accepted for prosecution as career criminals	0
3. TOTAL career criminal defendants completing grand jury process	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
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

Rev. 1995

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

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

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

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

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

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

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	2	0	0	22	8	32	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	0	0	0	26	0	26	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	2	0	0	48	8	58	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	2	0	0	48	8	58	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	1	0	1	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	2	0	0	47	8	57	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	0	0	0	0	0	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
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	0
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	12	4	0	0	0	16	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	100	28	1	0	0	129	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	112	32	1	0	0	145	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	107	29	0	0	0	136	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	20	6	0	0	0	26	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	1	0	0	0	0	1	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	1	0	0	0	0	1	
d. Closed - No further action	85	23	0	0	0	108	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	5	3	1	0	0	9	

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	19
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	6
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	2
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	1
3. Defendants charged through accusation	2
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	3
a. Defendants indicted	2
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	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	8	0	0	1	12	21	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	36	5	0	11	35	87	1
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	44	5	0	12	47	108	1
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	37	5	0	11	44	97	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	0	0	0	0	1	1	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	1	0	0	0	0	1	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	8	2	0	4	2	16	
d. Closed - No further action	28	3	0	7	41	79	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	7	0	0	1	3	11	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	3
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	0
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	0
a. Defendants indicted	0
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	31	0	0	5	10	46	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	55	4	0	147	8	214	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	86	4	0	152	18	260	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	66	4	0	150	11	231	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	8	0	0	3	0	11	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	58	4	0	147	11	220	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	20	0	0	2	7	29	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	4
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	4
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	7
a. Defendants indicted	7
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	5	1	0	0	6	12	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	27	0	1	5	54	87	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	32	1	1	5	60	99	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	24	1	1	2	57	85	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	1	0	0	0	8	9	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	2	0	1	0	2	5	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	21	1	0	2	47	71	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	8	0	0	3	3	14	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	9
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
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	4
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	2
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	8
a. Defendants indicted	8
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	2	3	0	0	0	5	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	2	34	1	0	38	75	14
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	4	37	1	0	38	80	14
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	4	30	1	0	38	73	14
a. Resulting in criminal charges	3	3	0	0	14	20	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	1	27	1	0	24	53	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	0	7	0	0	0	7	0

DISPOSITIONS OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES

DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CRIMINAL CHARGES	NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS
1. Defendants charged by complaint, TOTAL	6
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	1
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	14
3. Defendants charged through accusation	0
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	20
a. Defendants indicted	20
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	82	3	0	24	41	150	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	134	5	3	59	129	330	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	216	8	3	83	170	480	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	164	6	1	67	127	365	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	13	0	0	3	3	19	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	1	0	0	0	0	1	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	1	0	0	1	0	2	
d. Closed - No further action	149	6	1	63	124	343	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	52	2	2	16	43	115	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	9
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	1
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	3
2. Defendants with original charges presented to grand jury on direct presentment	0
3. Defendants charged through accusation	3
4. Defendants completing grand jury process on direct presentment and complaint presentation, TOTAL	5
a. Defendants indicted	5
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS	NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS BY TYPE -- Original and Post-complaint investigations						
	Original Investigations Conducted Jointly With:				Original Exclusive Investigations	TOTAL Original Investigations	TOTAL Post-complaint Investigations
	Local Police	State Agency	Other County Prosecutor	Other Agency			
1. Investigations pending or inactive at the beginning of the year	6	1	0	3	5	15	0
2. Investigations opened during the year	8	1	0	1	4	14	0
3. TOTAL Investigative workload for the year (add nos. 1 - 2)	14	2	0	4	9	29	0
4. TOTAL Investigations completed during this year (add a. - d.)	6	1	0	2	3	12	0
a. Resulting in criminal charges	4	1	0	0	3	8	
b. Referred to other agency for criminal prosecution	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c. Referred to other agency for civil or administrative action	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d. Closed - No further action	2	0	0	2	0	4	
5. Investigations pending or inactive at the end of the year	8	1	0	2	6	17	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	46
a. Defendants with complaints administratively dismissed	0
b. Defendants with complaints downgraded to disorderly persons offenses	0
c. Defendants with complaints referred to Family Court	0
d. Defendants with complaints presented to grand jury	46
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	43
a. Defendants indicted	43
b. Defendants no billed and remanded to municipal court	0
c. Defendants no billed/no action	0

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS

Appellate Division and Other Appellate Courts

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS/OUTCOMES	Appellate Division Appeals						NJ Supreme Court Appeals	U.S. and Other Court Appeals (specify court)	TOTAL
	Criminal referral cases	Other criminal appeals	Criminal Inter-locutory	Juvenile	Law Division (de novo)	Civil			
1. Appeals pending at beginning of the year	50	2	0	1	2	0	2	3	60
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	39	2	4	3	1	0	0	4	53
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	4	0	0	0	19	0	19
4. Appellate briefs filed	30	2	0	2	2	0	1	4	41
5. STATE Appeals and - TOTAL DISPOSED Cross Appeals	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
b. Conviction or order reversed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Remanded or judgment modified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. DEFENSE Appeals - TOTAL DISPOSED	42	1	2	3	1	0	2	2	53
a. Conviction or order affirmed	34	1	2	3	1	0	1	2	44
b. Conviction or order reversed	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
c. Remanded or judgment modified	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
7. Appeals pending at the end of the year	47	3	0	1	2	0	0	5	58

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS Law Division

APPELLATE WORKLOAD AND DISPOSITIONS/OUTCOMES	MUNICIPAL COURT APPEALS -- BY TYPE OF VIOLATION					TOTAL
	Criminal	Disorderly Persons	Motor Vehicle	Municipal Ordinances	Other	
1. Appeals pending at beginning of year	0	3	8	0	0	11
2. Notices of appeal received/filed	0	11	30	0	0	41
3. Appellate motions, motion responses filed	0	0	1	0	0	1
4. Appellate briefs filed	0	9	30	0	0	39
5. TOTAL APPEALS DISPOSED	0	12	30	0	0	42
a. Conviction or order affirmed	0	10	32	0	0	42
b. Conviction or order reversed	0	1	2	0	0	3
c. Remanded or judgment modified	0	0	1	0	0	1
d. Withdrawn or dismissed	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Appeals pending at the end of the year	0	2	8	0	0	10

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY INTAKE

Filings	Number of Juveniles	Number of Cases	Number of Offenses
1. TOTAL New Juvenile Delinquency Filings During the Year	858	1,125	1,915
a. Diverted		492	651
b. Juvenile Referee		125	209
c. Informal Calendar (Counsel Not Mandatory)		86	139
d. Formal Calendar (Counsel Mandatory)		415	965
2. Delinquency Filings Dismissed, Consolidated or Withdrawn During the Year		06	07
3. TOTAL Violations of Probation Filed During the Year	62	75	75
a. Informal Calendar (Counsel Not Mandatory)		0	0
b. Formal Calendar (Counsel Mandatory)		70	70

Form Cont=d, next page

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

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

Rev. 1999

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DISPOSED CASES

Disposed Cases	Number of Juveniles	Number of Cases
1. Total Juvenile Disposed Cases	507	626
a. Adjudicated Delinquent		352
b. Adjudicated Not Delinquent		1

Trials	
2. Total Number of Trials s Assistant Prosecutor Appearing	6
a. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent on One or More Charges at Trial.	3
b. Juveniles Adjudicated Not Delinquent at Trial.	3

JUVENILE WAIVER DECISIONS

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

JUVENILE HABITUAL OFFENDER PROGRAM WORKLOAD AND ADJUDICATIONS

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

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	NUMBER	VALUE
1. Notice of intention to solicit funds received	N/A	
2. Expungement applications received	413	
3. TOTAL number of forfeiture actions	*133	
4. Number of motor vehicles obtained through forfeiture actions	12 cars	
5. TOTAL value of property forfeited		\$ 288,073.49
a. Cash forfeited		\$ 241,273.49
b. Value of forfeited motor vehicles (Estimated Value)		\$ 46,100.00**
c. Value of other forfeited property (Estimated Value)		\$ 700.00***
(Specify property)		
One Samsung television, one Xbox game console with cables and controller		
* Total of 170 cases screened; 133 forfeitures filed; 37 forfeitures declined		
** Estimated Value of 12 cars forfeited and turned over to police departments - \$46,100.00		
*** Estimated value of 2 items forfeited and turned over to police departments - \$700.00		

VICTIM/WITNESS NOTIFICATION SERVICES

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

VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE
 SERVICES PROVIDED

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

ADULT DEFENDANTS WITH BIAS CRIME RELATED CHARGES DISPOSED

	TOTAL	NUMBER CONVICTED		ACQUITTED	DISMISSED	DOWNGRADE/ REMAND
		PLEA	TRIAL			
Number of defendants disposed	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom application for extended term of imprisonment made	0					
Number of defendants for whom application was granted	0					
Number of defendants for whom application was denied	0					
Number of defendants for whom simple assault was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of defendants for whom harassment was upgraded to 4th degree crime	0	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					

POLICE PURSUIT SUMMARY REPORT

Agency Burlington County Prosecutor's Office	County Burlington
Reporting Period January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	
Person completing report D/Sergeant Jonathan Gutkin	Date completed 3-27-17
Phone number 609-265-5152	

1. Number of pursuits initiated	72
2. Number of pursuits resulting in accidents	12
3. Number of pursuits resulting in injuries (NO DEATHS)	2
4. Number of pursuits resulting in death	0
5. Number of pursuits resulting in arrest	39
6. Number of vehicles in accidents	
a. Pursued vehicles	15
b. Police vehicles	5
c. Third party vehicles	4
7. Number of people injured	
a. Pursued vehicles	1
b. Police vehicles	1
c. Third party vehicles	0
d. Pedestrians	0
8. Number of people killed	
a. Pursued vehicles	0
b. Police vehicles	0
c. Third party vehicles	0
d. Pedestrians	0
9. Number of people arrested	40
10. Number of pursuits in which a tire deflation device was used	0

Section IV.14B

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2016

TABLE 1 -- COMPLAINTS FILED

Type of Complaint	Anonymous Complaints	Citizen Complaints	Agency Complaints	Total Complaints
Excessive Force	0	18	0	18
Improper Arrest	0	2	1	3
Improper Entry	0	1	0	1
Improper Search	1	3	0	4
Other Criminal Violation	2	23	3	28
Differential Treatment	0	37	0	37
Demeanor	1	78	13	92
Domestic Violence	0	0	3	3
Other Rule Violation	4	42	151	197
TOTAL	8	204	171	383

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2016

TABLE 2 -- AGENCY DISPOSITIONS

	Sustained	Exonerated	Not Sustained	Unfounded	Administratively Closed	Total Dispositions
Excessive Force	0	6	2	2	1	11
Improper Arrest	1	0	1	0	0	2
Improper Entry	0	1	0	0	0	1
Improper Search	0	3	0	1	0	4
Other Criminal Violation	0	11	0	9	2	22
Differential Treatment	0	15	7	9	3	34
Demeanor	18	12	27	9	11	77
Domestic Violence	0	1	0	0	0	1
Other Rule Violation	114	33	6	10	25	188
TOTAL	133	82	43	40	42	340

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS SUMMARY REPORT FORMS

Agency: Burlington County Prosecutor's Office

County: Burlington

Reporting Year: 2016

TABLE 3 -- COURT DISPOSITIONS

Court	Cases Dismissed	Cases Diverted	Acquittals	Convictions
Municipal Court	2	0	0	0
Superior Court	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	0	0	0

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)	2015	8,021,991.61	689,372.13
a. Salaries and Wages		7,818,809.58	669,743.00
b. Other Expenses		203,182.03	19,629.13
2. TOTAL Budgeted Appropriations, current report year (include all County, State and Federal funding)	2016	8,955,588.00	865,460.00
a. Salaries and Wages		8,758,760.00	651,287.00
b. Other Expenses		196,828.00	214,173.00