1		
2	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	COMMONWEALTH OF THE CRIMINAL CASE NO. 04-0106C	
8	NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,)
9	Plaintiff,)
10	v.))
11	DAVIS CLYDE P. DIAZ,) SENTENCE AND) COMMITMENT ORDER
12)
13	Defendant.)
14))
15)
16 		_/
17		
18	THIS MATTER came before the Court for a Sentencing on August 20, 2004, at 1:30 p.m.	
19	in courtroom 220A of the Guma Hustisia/Imwal Aweewee on Saipan. The Commonwealth of the	
20	Northern Mariana Islands was represented by Assistant Attorney General Phillip Tydingco.	
2122	Defendant Davis Clyde P. Diaz appeared with his counsel, Alexander Gorman, Esq.	
23	On June 2, 2004, the Defendant entered a guilty plea pursuant to a plea agreement, and this	
24		
25	Court found him guilty of Burglary, as charged in Count I of the Information, in violation of 6 CMC	
26	§ 1801(a); of Criminal Mischief as charged in Count III of the Information, in violation of 6 CMC	
27	§ 1803(a); and of misdemeanor Theft as charged in Count IV of the Information, in violation of 6	
28		-1-

10

11

2324

22

2526

27

28

CMC § 1601(a). The Court further finds that for the crime of Burglary, Defendant is subject, pursuant to 6 CMC § 1801(b)(2)(A) and 6 CMC § 4101(a), to a sentence of a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of ten (10) years; and to a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$10,000. For the crime of Criminal Mischief, Defendant is subject, pursuant to 6 CMC §§ 1803(b), 1601(b)(3) and 4101(c), to a sentence of a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of one (1) year; and to a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$1,000. For the crime of misdemeanor theft, Defendant is subject, pursuant to 6 CMC § 1601(b)(3) and 6 CMC § 4101(c), to a sentence of a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of one (1) year; and to a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$1,000.

SENTENCE

In this case, the victim of these crimes is a private citizen operating a store. The store happens to be attached to the victim's private home as well. The facts show that the Defendant and his accomplice entered the store by breaking into the victim's bedroom and literally into the victim's kitchen at night time. It is this Court's opinion that the Commonwealth Legislature purposely made the punishment of burglarizing a home at night punishable by not more than ten years, which is twice the punishment for the crime of a burglary of any other building, to deter people from committing this crime because it creates a high probability of someone getting seriously injured, even if there is no prior intent to inflict physical injury. Fortunately for the victim and the Defendant, the victim and her family were not at home at the time of the burglary and nobody was injured.

Another aggravating point in this case against the Defendant is the fact that when the Defendant and his accomplice entered the store, the Defendant and his accomplice took cigarettes, liquor, beer, and even butane. The Defendant stole things not to support himself for survival, but

"to do something exciting" and to satisfy his vices. He disregarded the sanctity of the victim's home to get to his quick butane high and to get his alcohol and cigarettes, all addictive materials. This is unacceptable and the Defendant needs to be taught a very important lesson.

Having reviewed the Pre-Sentence Investigation Report, the Court recognizes and considers the troubled upbringing the Defendant has endured. He comes from a broken home where both of his parents are drug addicts. His father is presently in prison for a drug-related conviction and his mother's conduct resulted in the Defendant and his siblings being placed in foster homes in Idaho when he was younger. In addition, the Defendant has expressed his remorse and sincere apology to both the victim and the Court, and accepts responsibility of his action. At the sentencing hearing, the Defendant stated that he understands his addiction to sniffing gas led him to commit these crimes, and that what he did was wrong. The Court accepts the Defendant's sincere statements as an indication of his efforts toward rehabilitation.

However, this Court takes special note of the fact that Defendant Davis Clyde P. Diaz is not a stranger to the criminal justice system. He previously pleaded guilty to an earlier crime which he committed with another defendant. In Criminal Case No. 03-0073, a co-defendant pleaded guilty to burglary, and on February 23, 2004, Diaz pleaded guilty to the crime of criminal mischief. Defendant Diaz committed the crimes in this case *on January 17, 2004, while the prior criminal case was still pending and the Defendant was charged with the crimes of burglary, criminal mischief, and conspiracy.* In the prior criminal case, he was facing the possibility of five years imprisonment for burglary, yet he engaged in the same criminal conduct again. To make matters worse, the other person involved in this burglary case was a minor at the time of this crime. As the adult relative, the Defendant should have known better and should have guided his younger relative

in the right direction.

Although the Defendant is single without any children and without either parent to assist him, it does not mean he should not care about what happens to himself or others. If he cannot restrain himself for his own sake, this Court must act to restrain him in order to protect the community.

The fact that the Defendant may have a serious substance abuse problem concerns the Court about the Defendant's ability to learn from his mistakes and avoid committing any future crimes. The defense argues that a sentence to time served is adequate punishment for the Defendant. Although the Defendant has already served six months in prison for this case, the sentence in this case is intended to ensure that the Defendant clearly understands the seriousness of his offenses, to deter him from committing any future crimes, and to help him receive the assistance he needs to accomplish the two. By taking away his freedom to be a part of this community, this Court is impressing on the Defendant to learn to appreciate the freedom he had, and the freedom he will get when he is released from prison. At the same time, this Court is not invoking its power to restrict the Defendant from being granted parole by the Board of Parole. The Court will allow the Defendant to rehabilitate himself and to prove to the Board of Parole that he is worthy of being released sooner than the entire unsuspended jail sentence imposed herein.

Finally, let this jail sentence deter other individuals from committing this dangerous and serious crime of burglary. The damage inflicted is not limited to the owners of the business, but also the customers who may potentially lose the convenience of a nearby store. As well, the damage is not limited to the owner of the household entered, but extends to other homeowners who fear becoming the next victim.

28