1 2 FOR PUBLICATION 3 4 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT 5 FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS 6 7 **COMMONWEALTH OF THE CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 05-0141C** NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, 8 Plaintiff, 9 **ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S** MOTION TO DISMISS WITH VS. PREJUDICE PURSUANT TO 10 MICHAEL C. DIAZ, **COM. R. CRIM. P. 48(a)** 11 Defendant. 12 13 14 T. **INTRODUCTION** 15 THIS MATTER came before the Court for a hearing on August 10, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. in 16 courtroom 220A, to consider Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss. The Commonwealth was 17 represented by Chief Prosecutor Jeffrey Moots. Defendant appeared with counsel, Assistant 18 Public Defender Angela M. Krueger. The Court, having reviewed the pleadings and the 19 memorandum filed, and having heard the arguments of counsel, now renders its written decision. 20 II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY 21 On May 18, 2005, the Commonwealth, through the Chief Prosecutor, charged the 22 Defendant with the misdemeanor crime of Assault and Battery for what appears to be a domestic 23 violence incident that occurred on or about October 5, 2003. About two months after the filing of the charge, on July 13, 2005, this Court set the case for a bench trial scheduled to begin on 24

1 September 13, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. The next day, a Pretrial Order was issued setting forth the 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

procedural deadlines to be followed by the parties in preparation for trial, including a deadline for the exchange of discovery materials. Less than three months after filing the Information, and more than a month prior to the trial date, the Commonwealth, through the same Chief Prosecutor, filed an ex parte motion to dismiss this case with prejudice pursuant to Rule 48(a) of the Commonwealth Rules of Criminal Procedure. In support of its motion, the Commonwealth stated that the basis for the dismissal is "for the government's failure to comply with the pre-trial order regarding Discovery." Based on this fact alone, the Commonwealth asserted that "it believes it is in the interest of justice to dismiss the case with prejudice." Pursuant to Rule 48(a), which requires the Government to obtain "leave of court" to file a dismissal of an information or complaint, this Court sua sponte set this matter for a status conference. Thereafter, the Defendant filed his brief in support of the Government's motion to dismiss this case with prejudice.

III. **ANALYSIS**

Because the Government has decided, in its discretion, to move to dismiss this case with prejudice pursuant to Rule 48(a), the Defendant supports the motion. Furthermore, in support of the Government's motion to dismiss for its "failure to comply with the pre-trial order regarding Discovery," the Defendant states that he has received no discovery, despite his discovery request. However, in his own distinction between Com. R. Crim. P. 48(b), which allows the Court to dismiss a case for the government's failure to prosecute, from Rule 16(d)(2), which authorizes "sanctions" for discovery violations, Defendant acknowledges that "sanctions" are appropriate for discovery violations. In fact, Defendant has filed numerous pre-trial motions in this case, including his Motion for Sanctions for Government's Failure to Comply with Discovery Deadlines in Case Management Order (#08). Defendant's own proposed sanctions do not

Rule 48(a) of the Commonwealth Rules of Criminal Procedure provides the mechanism by which the attorney for the Commonwealth may dismiss a criminal case. The relevant part provides as follows: "[t]he attorney for the government may by leave of court file a dismissal of an information . . . and the prosecution shall thereupon terminate." Com. R. Crim. P. 48(a) (emphasis added).

include a motion to dismiss this case with prejudice. Rather, the Defendant seeks an order of full disclosure of all police reports, police notes, witness interviews by police, and police memoranda. Defendant's motion for sanctions and proposed order was filed on July 22, 2005. Two weeks later, the Government filed the instant motion that results in an even more extreme sanction--- a dismissal with prejudice.

Rule 48(a) permits the court to deny a Government dismissal motion, to which a defendant has consented, if the motion is prompted by considerations clearly contrary to the public interest. *See Rinaldi v. United States*, 434 U.S. 22, 30 n.15, 98 S. Ct. 81, 86 n.15, 54 L. Ed. 2d 207, 209 n.15 (1977) (per curiam) (interpreting the counterpart Federal rule). Based on the procedural facts of this case, this Court initially concluded that the Prosecutor's failure to comply with a procedural discovery deadline *by itself* is an improper consideration to grant a dismissal *with prejudice*. However, in the hearing on this matter, the Chief Prosecutor provided additional factual information in support of the motion that convinces this Court that granting the Commonwealth's motion is proper. In particular, the Attorney General's Office, through the Chief Prosecutor, has represented that it made the decision to terminate the prosecution of this criminal case based on its careful review of how to best use its limited resources.² In addition, the Commonwealth has determined that the parties involved: Defendant and the alleged victim have since reconciled.

IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Based on the foregoing facts, Plaintiff's motion to dismiss this case with prejudice is hereby GRANTED.

² In this case, the Defendant has filed 18 different motions. The attorney for the Government has chosen to terminate the prosecution of this case rather than expend the Attorney General's resources responding to these numerous motions that it concedes are a product of the Prosecution's own mishandling of the case. This Court is deeply troubled by this fact, but finds that it must defer to the Prosecution's decision on how to manage its limited resources in line with the separation of powers doctrine.