1				
2	FOR PUBLICATION			
3				
4	IN THE CUD	EDIOD COUDT		
5	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE			
6	COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS			
7	COMMONWEALTH OF THE	CRIMINAL CASE NO. 03-0257B		
8	NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,	) CRIMINAL CASE NO. 03-0258C ) CRIMINAL CASE NO. 03-0286E		
9	Plaintiff,	CRIMINAL CASE NO. 03-0300C		
10	<b>v.</b>	) CRIMINAL CASE NO. 03-0301D		
		)		
11	MARY ANN DELA CRUZ INDALECIO,	) )		
12		SENTENCE AND		
13	Defendant.	) COMMITMENT ORDER		
14		)		
15				
16				
17	THIS MATTER came before the Court for a Sentencing on September 7, 2004, at 9:00 a.m.			
18	in courtroom 220A of the Guma Hustisia/Imwal Aweewee on Saipan. The Commonwealth of the			
19	Northern Mariana Islands was represented by As	ssistant Attorney General Janine R. Udui. Defendant		
20	Maryann Dela Cruz Indalecio appeared with her counsel, Loren Sutton, Esq.  On January 28, 2004, the Defendant entered a guilty plea pursuant to a Plea Agreement, and			
21				
22				
23	this Court found her guilty of:			
24	1. <b>Theft by Deception,</b> in violation	on of 6 CMC § 1603(a); and of <b>Issuance of a Bad</b>		
25	Check, in violation of 6 CM	IC § 1704(c), as charged in Counts I and II,		
26	respectively, of the Information 0257B;	n filed on July 28, 2003 in Criminal Case No. 03-		
27				
		1		
28		-1-		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	i
14	t
15	\$
16	
17	(
18	(
19	(
20	6
21	i
22	f
23	1
24	
25	
26	<b>↓</b>

27

28

- 2. Theft by Deception in violation of 6 CMC § 1603(a) as charged in Counts I and II; and Issuance of a Bad Check, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), as charged in Counts III and IV, of the Information filed on July 28, 2003, in Criminal Case No. 03-0258C;
- 3. **Issuance of a Bad Check**, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), as charged in **Counts VI, VII, IX, and X**, of the Information filed on September 25, 2003, in Criminal Case No. 03-0286E;
- 4. **Theft by Deception**, in violation of 6 CMC § 1603(a); and of **Issuance of a Bad Check**, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), as charged in **Counts I and II**, respectively, of the Information filed on October 1, 2003 in Criminal Case No. 03-0300C; and
- 5. **Issuance of a Bad Check**, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), as charged in **Counts V, VI, VII, VIII**, of the Information filed on October 1, 2003, in Criminal Case No. 03-0301D.

The Court further finds that in this case, for each crime of **Theft by Deception**, Defendant is subject under 6 CMC § 1601(b)(2) and 6 CMC § 4101(b) to a sentence of a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of five (5) years imprisonment; or to a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$5,000 fine; or both. For each crime of **Issuance of a Bad Check**, Defendant is subject under 6 CMC §§ 1601(b)(2) and 4101(b) to a sentence of a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of five (5) years imprisonment; or to a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$5,000; or both, except for **Counts V, VI, VII, and VIII** in **Criminal Case No. 03-0301D**, in which Defendant is subject under 6 CMC §§ 1601(b)(3) and 4101(c) to a minimum of no jail time to a maximum of one (1) year imprisonment, or a minimum of no fine to a maximum of \$1,000 fine, or both. In total, Defendant faces a maximum term of sixty-nine (69) years of imprisonment.

## **SENTENCE**

In these five criminal cases, the victims of these crimes are all private businesses. Three of the five businesses were victimized twice by the same Defendant, counting the uncharged case.

paid. The Defendant at each occasion issued a check that she knew would not be honored by her bank because she lacked the funds. The underlying incidents span a period of about one year, from June 2002, to as recently as May 2003. The items she received from these transactions range from small, inexpensive construction items such as rebar, bags of cement, and hollow blocks, to large expensive items such as air conditioners, freezers, and a computer laptop. Having reviewed all these items, one would think that a fair and simple resolution to minimize the damage inflicted on each of these businesses is to return the goods. However, as explained by the Defendant herself, she cannot do so because she pawned them for cash. So what then did the Defendant do with the cash? Pay off her creditors she explains, as well as provide for her family.

Each of the five businesses, in good faith, sold items to the Defendant with the expectation to be

First, the old adage "crime does not pay" comes to mind. Defendant claims she used some of the cash she received from pawning the store goods to pay her creditors. However, the private attorney for 41 judgment creditors of the Defendant reported that Defendant owed a total of \$47,027.44 as of July 2004, and that although the Defendant was ordered on April 12, 2004 to pay the balance of these judgments at the rate of \$50.00 bi-weekly, she has failed to make any payments as required by the Court's order. Furthermore, on the same date she was ordered to make the partial payments, the Defendant resigned from her job citing the "low pay" of \$3.05 per hour and "strenuous tasks" as a sales clerk. The Defendant's conduct in this instance do not show any remorse or sincerity of her intent to make her victims whole. At the same time, the Court has been informed that the Defendant managed to pay another judgment creditor the full judgment balance of \$777.60 on July 8, 2004, even though she reported that she is currently unemployed. She paid this one creditor by raising money selling hot lunches. Although this Court commends the

Defendant for paying one of her creditors, the Court is troubled that she unilaterally decided to disregard the Court's April 2004, payment order by failing to make any of the minimum bi-weekly payments to the other 41 judgment creditors but instead paid another creditor more than \$700 at one time. Again, she has not shown any sincere intent to pay all her creditors and make them whole.

Second, this society does not allow people to "steal from Peter to pay Paul." The Court has reviewed the Pre-sentence Investigation Report, and finds that the Defendant is a young woman capable of working, yet she chooses to be unemployed. The Defendant is married and has one child, yet she does not exhibit a sense of financial responsibility. She comes from a large family, being the youngest among ten brothers and sisters. With such a large source of family support, compensating her victims should be possible. Instead, Defendant is still in a serious financial bind.

Given the potential 69 years of imprisonment she is facing for these convictions, the Court expects the Defendant to be more diligent about taking responsibility for all of her actions. Just because the Defendant appeared before her victims before victimizing them does not make these crimes any less repulsive. Committing the crimes of theft by deception, or issuance of a bad check, does not make her any less of a criminal than a thief in the night. Defendant's repeated conduct needs to be stopped and be deterred.

Although the Defendant does not have any history with the criminal justice system, the Court is concerned about the Defendant's long history with financial problems. One of her former employers stated that "as an employee she performed her job and has good relation to her co-worker. *But when it comes to money, it was always her problem.*" The small claims and civil action records support this statement. According to the Pre-sentence Investigation Report, Defendant has 41 judgment creditors with the Law Offices of White, Pierce, Mailman & Nutting, one case with the

1
 2
 3

Law Offices of Robert T. Torres, and eight cases with the Law Offices of Joshua Berger. Looking at the names of the different plaintiffs in the small claims and civil action cases, it is apparent that the Defendant spared no one in the business community.

The Court is convinced that the Defendant has a serious financial problem arising from a source she has not identified. She apparently does not consume alcoholic beverages or abuse illicit drugs. However, there is a concern about her playing poker. Her husband suspects it, based on information he received from other family members. Although Defendant has not openly admitted to any addiction to playing poker, her financial quandary speaks for her.

Based on the foregoing facts, this Court finds that a jail sentence is necessary to deter the Defendant as well as other people from committing these white collar crimes because they do cause a serious harm to the members of the community. The damage inflicted is not limited to the business owners, but also the employees who want to be paid promptly and who want to have job security, the creditors of the businesses who want to extend credit to the business operators, and the consumers who end up paying the additional costs incurred by the businesses to protect themselves from being defrauded again.

In view of the foregoing facts, this Court hereby sentences Defendant MaryAnn Dela Cruz Indalecio as follows:

- 1. <u>In Criminal Case No. 03-0257B</u>, for **Count I, Theft by Deception**, in violation of 6 CMC 1603(a), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of five (5) years, all suspended except for two years; and for **Count II, Issuance of a Bad Check**, in violation of 6 CMC 1704(c), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of **five** (5) years, all suspended except for two years. The five year sentences shall run *consecutively*, but the two years of imprisonment shall be served concurrently.
- 2. <u>In Criminal Case No. 03-0258C</u>, for **Counts I and II**, **Theft by Deception** in violation of 6 CMC § 1603(a), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of **five**

1 2 3		(5) years each, all suspended except for two years each; and for Counts III and IV, Issuance of a Bad Check, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of five (5) years, all suspended except for two years. The five year sentences shall run concurrently, and the two years of imprisonment shall be served concurrently.
4 5	3.	In Criminal Case No. 03-0286E, for Counts VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X, Issuance of a Bad Check, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), Defendant shall be imprisoned
6		for a term of <b>five</b> (5) <b>years each, all suspended except for two years each</b> . The sentences shall all run concurrently.
7	4	In Criminal Case No. 02 0200C for Count I That by Decention in violation
8	4.	In Criminal Case No. 03-0300C, for Count I, Theft by Deception, in violation of 6 CMC § 1603(a); Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of five (5) years, all suspended except for two years; and for Count II, Issuance of a Bad
10		Check, in violation of 6 CMC 1704(c), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of five (5) years, all suspended except for two years. The five year sentences
11		shall run consecutively, but the two years of imprisonment shall be served concurrently.
12		·
13	5.	In Criminal Case No. 03-0301D, for Counts V, VI, VII, VIII, Issuance of a Bad Check, in violation of 6 CMC § 1704(c), Defendant shall be imprisoned for a term of one (1) year each. The sentences shall run concurrently.
14		term of one (1) year each. The sentences shan run concurrently.
15 16	6.	The terms of actual imprisonment shall all run concurrently in these five cases. The Defendant shall report to the Division of Corrections for a term of <b>two years</b> commencing on September 21, 2004 at 8:00 a.m.
17	These sen	atences are subject to the following terms and conditions:
18		
19	1.	The Defendant shall be on supervised probation during the suspended sentence,
20		under the direction and supervision of the Office of Adult Probation. The
21		Defendant shall observe all directives imposed by the Office of Adult Probation;
22	2.	The Defendant shall write a letter of apology to the victims in this case, and
23		submit it to her probation officer within thirty days, and one letter shall be
24		published in a local newspaper;
25		published in a local newspaper,
26	3.	The Defendant shall pay restitution to the victims. The parties shall meet and
27		discuss a stipulated restitution amount, and submit such an amount to the Court
28		-6-

1		within sixty days. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement, the Court will
2		schedule a sentencing hearing to make the final determination;
3	4.	The Defendant shall submit herself for an evaluation by the Community Guidance
4		Center ("CGC") for counseling and/or treatment, and shall comply with any
5		recommendation by CGC;
7	5.	The Defendant shall seek and maintain full-time employment ("seek" is defined
8	3.	
9		as submitting at least ten job applications per week, and "full-time" is defined as
10		working at least 32 hours per week);
11	6.	The Defendant shall perform five hundred (500) hours of community work
12		service at a minimum of 20 hours per month if she is unemployed, and a
13		minimum of 8 hours per month if she is employed;
14	7.	The Defendant shall pay a fine of \$100;
15	8.	The Defendant shall pay the \$100 court assessment fee within 30 days of her
16		sentence pursuant to Public Law 11-105;
17	9.	The Defendant shall pay an annual probation fee of \$100 pursuant to Public Law
18 19		11-82, at a minimum rate to be determined by the probation officer;
20	10	
21	10.	The Defendant shall obey all Commonwealth, Federal, and State laws (minor
22		traffic infractions excluded).
23	Pursuant to the Plea Agreement, the Defendant is ordered to pay restitution in the uncharged	
24	criminal case, for Check No. 203 drawn on the Account of Mary Ann Dlc. Indalecio, Bank Pacific	
25	Account No. 7005-112707, made payable to JD's Appliance Store in the amount of \$486.55; and	
26	for Check No. 20	, in the amount of \$486 written on Bank Pacific Account No. 7005-112707, made
27		
28		-7-

1	payable to JD's Appliance Store.
2	Failure to comply with any of the above terms and conditions shall constitute a violation of
3	the terms and conditions of the suspended sentence and shall subject the Defendant to revocation
4 5	proceedings.
6	After the sentence was pronounced, the Defendant was advised that she has the right to
7	appeal the Court's sentence within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of this order.
8	
9	IT IS SO ORDERED this 7th day of September 2004.
10	/s/
11	RAMONA V. MANGLONA, Associate Judge
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	
27	
28	-8-