1			
2			
3			
4			
5	FOR PUBLICATION		
6			
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT		
8	OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS		
9			
10	COMMONWEALTH OF THE) NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,)	Criminal Action No. 08-0083	
11	Plaintiff,		
12	vs.	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR BILL OF	
13		PARTICULARS	
14	LUIS P. CRUZ,		
15	Defendant.		
16			
17			
18	I. INTRODUCTION On December 1, 2008, Defendant filed the current motion requesting a Bill of Particulars pursuant to Commonwealth Rule of Criminal Procedure 7. Also filed at that time was a motion requiring the government to disclose notice of intent to introduce other act evidence and a motion for disclosure of witnesses. At this time, the court will address only the motion for a Bill of		
19			
20			
21 22			
23			
24	Particulars. Joey P. San Nicolas is counsel for Defendant Luis P. Cruz (Defendant).		
25			
26	II. FACTS		
27	On May 4, 2008 the Commonwealth filed an information charging Defendant with one count		
28	of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon in violation of 6 CMC § 1204(a) and one count of Aggravated		

Assault and Battery in violation of 6 CMC § 1203(a). The first count appears as follows:

COUNT I: ASSSAULT WITH A DANGEROUS WEAPON

On or about April 13, 2008, on Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Defendant, LUIS P. CRUZ, did unlawfully threaten to cause, attempt to cause, and/or purposely cause bodily injury to Mr. Jingzhu Cui with a dangerous weapon, to wit: a helmet, in violation of 6 CMC §1204(a), punishable by 6 CMC §§ 1204(b), 4101(a), and 4102(a).

The second count appears as follows:

COUNT II: AGGRAVATED ASSAULT AND BATTERY

On or about April 13, 2008, on Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Defendant, LUIS P. CRUZ, did purposely, knowingly, or recklessly cause serious bodily injury to Mr. Jingzhu Cui, to wit: severe head trauma, in violation of 6 CMC §1203(a), made punishable by 6 CMC §§ 1203(b) and 4101(b).

On May 9, 2008, Defendant was arraigned and entered a not guilty plea as to each of the counts of the information. On December 1, 2008, Defendant filed three motions. The first is a motion seeking an order of the Court compelling the Commonwealth to provide Defendant with a written bill of particulars elaborating the factual basis of each count in the information. In addition, Defendant filed a motion seeking disclosure of information pertaining to any witness or informant. Lastly, Defendant filed a motion which seeks disclosure of prosecutor's intent to introduce other act evidence.

As to the motion for a bill of particulars, the information adequately puts Defendant on notice as to what allegedly occurred and sufficiently states facts which constitute a crime. Any further information that Defendant seeks will be sufficiently revealed through discovery. Therefore, for the reasons stated below, the motion for a bill of particulars is hereby DENIED.

III. DISCUSSION

1. Motion for Bill of Particulars

Defendant argues that the information does not provide enough specificity as to the date or time of the alleged incident, that there are no specific facts as to what Defendant allegedly did that constitute a crime, and that no facts are pled to give Defendant sufficient notice as to what he has allegedly done.

The decision on whether to direct the filing of a Bill of Particulars is within the trial court's discretion. *United States v. Mitchell*, 744 F.2d 701, 705 (9th Cir. 1984). The main purpose of the Information is to provide a defendant notice of the charges that have been filed against him, as well as listing the acts committed that provided the basis for such charges. *Id.* A bill of particulars is not needed if the Information itself provides sufficient details of the charges and the Government provides full discovery to the defense. *Id.*

Rule 7(f) of the Commonwealth Rules of Criminal Procedure allows the Court to direct the Commonwealth to file a bill of particulars to supplement the factual basis for an Information:

The court may direct the filing of a bill of particulars. A motion for a bill of particulars may be made before the arraignment or within ten (10) days after arraignment or at such later time as the court may permit. A bill of particulars may be amended at any time subject to such conditions as justice requires.

Com. R. Crim. P. 7(f).

Rule 7(c)(1) of the Commonwealth Rules outlines the requirements incumbent upon the Commonwealth when filing an information:

The information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government. It need not contain a formal commencement, a formal conclusion, or any other matter not necessary to such statement. Allegations made in one count may be incorporated by reference into another count. It may be alleged in a single count the means by which the defendant committed the offense are unknown or that he committed it by one or more specified means. The information shall state for each count the citation of the statute, rule, regulation or other provision of law which the defendant is alleged to have violated.

Com. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1).

The Commonwealth Rules of Criminal Procedure closely parallel their federal counterparts and therefore interpretations of the federal rules are instructive. *Commonwealth v. Ramangmau*, 4 N.M.I. 227, 233 (1995). The Ninth Circuit has found the purpose of a bill of particulars to be threefold: (1) to reduce surprise; (2) to enable adequate trial preparation; and (c) to protect the defendant against being placed in double jeopardy. *United States v. Long*, 706 F.2d 1044, 1054 (9th Cir. 1983) (citation omitted); *United States v. Giese*, 597 F.2d 1170, 1180-81 (9th Cir.) (defendant not entitled to "the 'when, where, and how' of every act in furtherance of a conspiracy charge") (citation omitted), *cert. denied*, 444 U.S. 979 (1979). Moreover, full discovery of the case will

"obviate the need for a bill of particulars." Giese 597 F.2d at 1180.

On its face, Rule 7(c)(1) requires little more than a "plain statement... of essential facts constituting the offense." According to the Commonwealth Supreme Court, a "bill of particulars is only necessary when an information is deficient or otherwise insufficient. Commonwealth v. Castro, 2008 MP 18 ¶ 12, App. No. 04-0029 (N.M.I. Sup. Ct. August 22, 2008) ([Unpublished] Opinion). If the information contains "the official citation of the statute under which the defendant is charged and the evidence constitutes precise proof of the charges. . . denial of a motion for a bill of particulars is not an abuse of discretion". *Id.* at ¶ 14.

Thus, the Commonwealth need only to provide Defendant with those facts that satisfy the essential elements of the underlying offense. Here, by statute, a person is guilty of assault with a dangerous weapon if he threatens to cause, attempts to cause, or purposely causes bodily injury to another with a dangerous weapon. 6 CMC § 1204(a). The information in this case has provided those required essential facts in its description which specifically lists who was allegedly injured, when and where the assault allegedly took place, and the type of alleged dangerous weapon used in commission of the assault – "a helmet".

Count two of the information charges Defendant with aggravated assault and battery. By statute, a person is guilty of aggravated assault and battery if he causes serious bodily injury, purposely, knowingly or recklessly. 6 CMC §1203(a). Again, the information has provided those required essential facts in its description which specifically lists who was allegedly injured, when and where the assault took place, and the alleged serious bodily injury which was caused by the assault – "severe head injury".

The government has satisfied its burden in the Information because the Information contained language of the statutes allegedly violated, the date of the action, and the specific action which constituted the crime. The Commonwealth, by Rule, need not bare their entire theory of the case for the defense at the outset of trial. Further, discovery exchanges will help to ameliorate any problems arising from the factual gaps in the Information.

1	III. CONCLUSION
2	In conclusion, the Commonwealth has provided Defendants with a sufficient notice of the
3	charges to prepare an adequate defense and discovery will likely obviate any need for a Bill of
4	Particulars. For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's Motion for a Bill of Particulars is DENIED.
5	
6	
7	So ORDERED this <u>11th</u> day of December 2008.
8	
9	<u>/S/</u>
10	David A. Wiseman, Associate Judge
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	