SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM

1

2

3

4

5

PEOPLE OF GUAM.

DOB: 03/21/1978

v.

PETER PANGELINAN REYES.

Defendant.

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

2024 MAR 22 PM 1:25

CLERK OF COURT

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM

Criminal Case No. CF0474-17 GPD Report No. 17-22645

**DECISION AND ORDER GRANTING** PEOPLE'S MOTION TO REVOKE DEFENDANT'S PROBATION

## INTRODUCTION

This matter came before the Honorable Alberto C. Lamorena, III on February 29, 2024 for a Revocation Hearing in the above-captioned matter related to Peter Pangelinan Reyes's "Defendant's") failure to abide by his probationary terms. Defendant was represented by Assistant Public Defender Renita Taimanao. The People of Guam were represented by Assistant Attorney General Grant Olan. Having duly considered the Parties' briefs, oral arguments, and the applicable law, the Court now issues the following Decision and Order Granting Revocation of Probation.

## **BACKGROUND**

On May 13, 2022, Defendant pled guilty to Manufacturing a Schedule I Controlled Substance (as a 1<sup>st</sup> Degree Felony). See Judgment of Conviction (Jun. 27, 2022). A judgment was entered imposing the following relevant conditions of probation:

> MANDATORY REPORTING: Upon release from the Department of Corrections, Defendant shall report to the Adult Probation Office for intake and processing within forty-eight (48) hours of being released.

1	• MANDATORY REPORTING: Defendant shall report to the Adult Probation
2	Office three (3) times per week in person, or as ordered by the Court or the
3	Probation Office.
4	<u>Id.</u>
5	The following month, a Violation Report was filed indicating that Defendant had failed to
6	report to the Adult Probation Office for intake and processing within forty-eight (48) hours of being
7	released. See Violation Report (Jun. 24, 2022). In fact, Defendant had failed to report to the Adul
8	Probation Office even once during the first six weeks of his probationary term. Id.
9	On January 9, 2023, another Violation Report was filed indicating that Defendant had failed
10	to report to the Adult Probation Office for several weeks following his latest release from the
11	Department of Corrections. See Violation Report (Jan. 9, 2023).
12	On May 31, 2023, another Violation Report was filed indicating that, yet again, Defendant had
13	failed to report to the Adult Probation Office for several weeks following his latest release from the
14	Department of Corrections. See Violation Report (May 31, 2023).
15	On June 2, 2023, the People filed their Motion to Revoke Defendant's Probation ("Motion").
16	The People base their request on Defendant's repeated failures to report to the Adult Probation
17	Office since entering probation. See Motion (Jun. 2, 2023). Opposing the Motion, Defendant
18	claims revocation is premature because he has ample time to complete his remaining probationary
19	
20	terms and requirements. See Opposition to Motion (Aug. 31, 2023).
21	On February 29, 2024, the Court held a Revocation Hearing and subsequently took the
22	matter under advisement. See Minute Entry (Feb. 29, 2024).
23	DISCUSSION
24	Guam law specifies the procedures that the Court must follow for revocation of probation.
25	The relevant statute, in its entirety, states as follows:
26	
27	[T]he court, if satisfied that the offender has inexcusably failed to comply with a substantial requirement imposed as a condition of the order may revoke the
28	suspension or probation and sentence or re-sentence the offender. Violation of a condition shall not result in revocation, however, unless the court determines that

Based on a review of the record, it is clear that Defendant has exhausted the trust of the Court by violating his probationary conditions. Defendant's violations occurred almost immediately upon entering probation, as he failed to even report to the Adult Probation Office for his initial intake/scheduling. Defendant continued to violate his mandatory reporting conditions, receiving multiple Violation Reports for the same repeated conduct. This suggests Defendant was never serious about following his probation conditions, and will not follow them now if given another chance.

Were probation continued, it appears unlikely that any significant progress would be made in positively altering Defendant's behavior and ensuring compliance with the Court's orders. Therefore, the Court finds that revocation is in the public's best interest and satisfies the ends of justice. See 9 GCA § 80.66(a)(2).

## **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, the Court hereby **REVOKES** the Defendant's probation in the above-captioned matter. The Defendant is hereby **SENTENCED** to **three (3) years incarceration** at the Department of Corrections, Mangilao with credit for time served. After the completion of the Defendant's sentence the Court shall close the above-captioned case.

SERVICE VIA EMAIL
I acknowledge that an electronic copy of the original was e-mailed to:

Date: 3 WATIME: 1:30

According 1:30

Deputy Clerk, Superior Court of Guam